WITHDRAWN

INSPIRATION OR EVOLUTION

W. B. RILEY, D. D.

Pacific Christian College

2500 E. Nutwood Ave.
Fullerton, CA 92631

Azusa Pacific Library 1974

Fred A. Smith.
Upland.
Calif

15.7 Riley
573i Inspiration or evolution

29412

HURST MEMORIAL LIBRARY
Pacific Christian College
2500 E. Nutwood
Fullerton, CA 92631

INSPIRATION
OR
EVOLUTION

By

W. B. Riley, D. D.

Author of "The Perennial Revival", "The Crisis of the Church", "The Evolution of the Kingdom", "The Menace of Modernism", etc.

HURST MEMORIAL LIBRARY
Pacific Christian College
2500 E. Nutwood
Fullerton, CA 92631

PUBLISHED BY
UNION GOSPEL PUBLISHING CO.,
CLEVELAND, OHIO

Copyright, 1923
by
Dr. W. B. Riley

29412 R573L

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	The Bible—Is It an Evolution or an Inspiration?	7
II.	The Theory of Evolution—Does It Tend to Atheism?	29
III.	The Theory of Evolution—Does It Tend to Anarchy?	49
IV.	Civilization—Is It an Evolution?	67
V.	Evolution or Sovietizing the State through Its Schools	89
VI.	Shall We Longer Tolerate the Teaching of Evolution?	113
VII.	The Conflict of Christianity with Its Counterfeit	135
VIII.	Corporate Control—The Peril of Christian Education	159
IX.	The Present Crisis in the Professing Church!	179
X.	A Sceptic's Philosophy and the Second Coming	203
XI.	Prophecy and the Approaching Kingdom	225
XII.	Modernism—or the Challenge of Orthodoxy	245

FOREWORD.

The greatest menace to Christianity and to American democracy is the modernist professor; and, second only to this ministry of evil is the modernist pulpit. At the close of a recent service a shabbily dressed man hung in the front hallway of my church until all others were out of the way; then, approaching me, he said, "Preacher, if you do not stop the preaching of the I. W. W.s in the streets of this city the time will shortly come when there will be no churches left and no country that a man can live in." To this I necessarily replied, "America is a free country, and I know of no way by which I. W. W. preaching can be ended." But the public schools of America and the denominational schools are alike dependent for personal and financial patronage upon tax payers, millions of whom are the best citizens of America. This book is addressed particularly to this class, and is intended as "A call to arms!" If we silently and indolently endorse the destructive doctrines to which this volume calls attention, we will deserve the fate that is certain to befall both Church and State. The munitions of war for the Christian citizen are his voice and vote. He who does not employ both to preserve the democracy of America and the integrity of her true churches is a traitor to both Country and Christ.

The author dares to hope that this volume, in addition to stirring revolutionary sentiment, may be employed in many schools as a text book on the subject to which it addresses itself.

CHAPTER I

THE BIBLE—IS IT AN EVOLUTION OR AN INSPIRATION?

THE BIBLE—IS IT AN EVOLUTION OR AN INSPIRATION?

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God" (II Tim. 3: 16).

THE supreme question for the 20th Century Christian is this: "The Bible, is it an evolution or an inspiration?" Since this question is fundamental in my profession, and its answer affects the very life of Christianity itself, I claim at once an inalienable right and a comparative fitness for its discussion.

"New" theologians are now writing books on "The Religion of a Mature mind", "The Mature Man's Difficulties with His Bible" etc., and it may be conceded by them that forty consecutive years of Bible study on the part of even a conservative ought to result in some mature opinions, and certainly since the very question is basal to conservatism, the orthodox have a right to discuss it.

The inspiration of the Bible is, of course, "the traditional view." That too-common teacher-custom of speaking contemptuously of "the traditional view" is as unwarranted as superficial. Dr. John Urquhart said, "The Copernican theory of the motions of the heavenly bodies has become the traditional view". Is it any the less true on that account? "That it is the traditional view may be regarded on the contrary as something in its favor. It could hardly have endured so long, under the close and continued inspection of modern science, unless it had much to support it". This

traditional view of the Scriptures has been the subject of the closest scrutiny, of the most careful investigation, of the most continuous and even vicious assault; and yet it stands as a veritable Gibraltar against which "modernism" marshals its increasing forces to little avail.

In order to answer this question, however, we must consider both the inspirational and evolutionary claims.

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION.

When Charles Darwin first exploited the modern theory of evolution, men little dreamed the lengths to which his hypothesis would be pushed. It is very doubtful if it was supposed even by him to have reference to anything more than the existence and development of life.

Science is specific and limited; philosophy on the contrary is as indefinite and unlimited as its author cares to make it.

No less an authority than Mark Hopkins, the great educator, said, "Men who are most reliable in observing facts are often least so in drawing inferences".

As an investigator, Darwin may be called a scientist; as a philosopher, he was most unscientific.

The theory of evolution itself is an assumption, not a science. It is impossible for one to read the Standard Dictionary definition of science—"knowledge gained and verified by exact observation and correct thinking, especially as made clear, formu-

lated and arranged in a rational system", and Darwin's writings, without realizing the remote remove of the one from the other. For instance over 800 times, Darwin says "We may well suppose". How strange to call an unlimited series of suppositions a science. Certainly Louis Pasteur had occasion for his statement, "Theories come into our laboratory by the bushel. When they have served their purpose they are thrown out of the window". Had he kept in mind Darwin's speculations, he might have changed his speech in the matter of measure, saying "Theories come into our laboratory by the ton".

This has always been true of the scientific laboratory, and the dump-heap of theoretical refuse holds some strange suppositions. It is not so long ago since Van Helmont, a celebrated alchemist, taught that "the smells which arise from the bottom of morasses produce frogs, slugs, leeches and other things". When Sir Thomas Browne expressed doubt as to whether mice were bred of putrefaction, a famous scientist, Sir Alexander Ross, hotly replied, "So may he doubt whether in cheese and timber, worms are generated; or if beetles and wasps in cows' dung; or if butterflies, locusts, grasshoppers, shell-fish, snails, eels, and such like, be procreated of putrid matter, which is apt to receive the form of that creature to which it is by formative power disposed. To question this is to question reason, sense and experience. If he doubts this, let him go to Egypt and there will find the fields swarming with mice, begot of the

mud of Nylus". I haven't a doubt that the college students who sat at the feet of Prof. Ross believed that he had utterly demolished not only Sir Thomas Browne, but the first chapter of Genesis, by that statement, and in fact he had as good a foundation for his statement as Darwin has ever yet presented for his Origin of Species.

Ernst Haeckel the infidel instructor of Jena, says that "in the second half of the 19th century, the science of evolution attained to a perfect clearness and a universal application". Haeckel's speech is with forethought. He doesn't propose to limit this theory to vegetable and animal existence but to apply it at every point of human thought, including at once the Scriptures and involving even the Christ of God.

In the realm of Scripture, this theory is a pure speculation. If concerning the origin of species Mr. Darwin was led to remark as many as 800 times "we may well suppose", the application of this theory to the origin and growth of the Bible is "supposition" raised to the nth degree. Denying alike the age and authorship of the Old and New Testament books, the evolutionists "assume" another age; "assume" other authors; "assume" compositions; "assume" accretions; "assume" additions, combinations, translations, transpositions, improvements, evolutions. The recurrent phrase, "Thus saith the Lord" of the Scriptures, is equalled and overmatched by the repeated "We may well suppose" of the new school.

There is a principle in education upon which I

observed while a student, that explains the growth and popularity of modern skepticism. It is this; that student whose memory is most retentive is always regarded by his professor as the brilliant pupil, and often on that very account advised to "specialize in some science". But one would need only to consult the consensus of class opinion to discover that his fellow-students seldom hold the judgment and reasoning powers of such a pupil in any considerable esteem. His teacher and text book provide him all his opinions. He is like a sponge that absorbs easily and leaks under the lightest pressure, but no change whatever takes place in the opinion he takes in on the one side and passes out on the other. He is an intellectual parrot! With apologies to the exception who is capable of personal thinking, he is prime material for a school professor, but is non-dependable as a philosopher and equally non-reliable as a scientist.

Let me give a single illustration in proof of this. Dr. John A. Rice has recently been forced from the presidency of the Southern Methodist University at Dallas, Texas, on account of his skeptical teachings. In his book on "The Old Testament in the Life of To-day", he states what he has picked up from somebody's pen, namely, "That the book of Deuteronomy was not written until the 8th century before Christ" and he attempts to explain the reason for writing it in this language. "During this period when the old Canaanitish cults were flourishing, reinforced by Assyrian ideas and customs, the book of Deuteronomy was written to offset

the current evils of the day. It was the joint product of the prophet and the priest, with the prophet in the ascendency; it was written and laid aside in the Temple where it was discovered in 621 B. C."

How illuminating! Can anybody imagine such a fool as was the author of that book? To produce such a volume, at a time of such need, at such an enormous pains, to meet an exigency; and then lay it up in the Temple and leave it, and go your way to your grave and perhaps sleep the sleep of the dead for 200 years before your book was even discovered! The brilliance of such a supposition ought to impress any man with Rice's scholarship, and for that matter with the scholarship of the Wellhausen school from which he absorbed his suggestion!

There is only one possible explanation of the attempt to apply the evolution theory to the origin and growth of the Bible—that is found in an indisputable fact, namely,

This theory is the conception and expression of skepticism, not science. It is well known that it originated with unbelievers. Darwin was made an agnostic thru his own speculations. Spencer was a skeptic; Huxley was an agnostic and Haeckel was an atheist, who called himself a monist. Not a single one of these men was ever famed as a Bible student. When they touch upon the subject of religion at all, they prove their contempt for it. Haeckel reveals his utter antagonism to Christianity again and again. To him the Christian faith

was a "superstition" and the adoption of it was "stupidity". He says, "Never will our government improve until it casts off the fetters of the church". And again, "The climax of the opposition to modern education and its foundation, advanced natural philosophy, is reached, of course, in the church".

It is not unnatural therefore that young men and women taught by such teachers, taking into the very lungs of their intellects the atmosphere of such text books as they produced, should turn out liberalists, free-thinkers, monists, infidels, atheists! Like begets like. If the colleges and universities of this day had, in a solemn convocation, deliberately decided to extinguish the Bible, annihilate Christianity and introduce a reign of intellectual and moral terror, they need not have changed their educational methods one whit. The election of these infidels as the leaders of thought, and the adoption of text books based upon their unbelieving philosophy, and the stressing of their so-called science as against the Scriptures, is the exact course to be taken in effecting such an end, and the next quarter of a century will make manifest to the whole world, that if the present teaching and text books are continued, Christianity will almost as completely perish from our land as it has from the soil that sprouted it! The paganism of the Arab of Judea, and the savagery of the Turk of Palestine will be equalled if not exceeded by the coming American citizen! The fact that we keep the Occidental dress as the Germans do, and a veneer of manners, will in no wise save our morals

nor lend any conceivable escape from that savagery which produced the late World War, the war for which a single man—Nietzsche the ablest exponent of evolution yet produced,—was most responsible. "When the foundations are removed what shall the righteous do?"

But to appeal to your reason rather than to your fears, I ask your attention next to

THE CLAIM OF INSPIRATION

on the contention of the text, "All Scripture is inspired of God".

That contention has back of it the clear claims of the Bible itself. Every prophet professes to record what he received from God. The New Testament writers were equally explicit in their contention of divine authority for what they said. The Old Testament claimed that word and thought alike were given of God. God was with Moses' mouth (Ex. 4:10-12) and taught him what he should say. God was in David's tongue (2 Sam. 23:1-2) imparting speech. God put His testimony into Jeremiah's mouth (Jer. 1:6-9). Peter said, "No prophecy ever came by the will of man". Paul contended that both the thoughts and words in which he expressed himself were alike inspired (I Cor. 2:12-13). Jesus said of His speech, "The Father gave me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak." The modernist's opposition to the verbal inspiration of the Bible is another proof of his defective mental processes. Dr. Kuyper has wisely said, "You can as easily have music without

notes or Mathematics without figures as thought without words!" People sometimes say, "A penny for your thoughts". If they have not taken the form of words, they are not worth it. The only thoughts that have ever been regarded as of sufficient importance to record had first to take the form of words, and that theory of the inspiration of the Bible which accords divinity to the thoughts and denies it to the language in which they are clothed, is as illogical as unscriptural, as unscientific as superficial. He who disregards the claim of inspiration made by the Bible, in that very denial abolishes the Book itself. Often as Mr. Darwin said of his speculations "We may well suppose", oftener yet do the scriptures affirm, "This is the word of the Lord".

If one says that the contention for the authority of the Bible on the basis of its self-assertion is reasoning in a circle, it is sufficient to answer "We take the testimony of a man for himself, provided his testimony on all other matters is true" and to this test we are perfectly willing to have the Bible subjected. If what it has to say on other subjects is certified by the centuries of human experience and observation, why deny or even doubt its assertions concerning its own character.

Again, It has beneath it the buttressing walls of Bible history. This book is not a novelty. Its latest utterances wear the ermined majesty of millenniums. Its every page has been exposed to any and every investigator, friend or foe, for thousands of years, and in all cases where unbelieving

prejudice did not exceed that of Pilate, candid men have been compelled to say, "We find no fault in it". The testimony popularly borne against the Pentateuch is a mass of perjured lies. The denial of the historicity of the Old Testament events, in the name of science, is nothing short of the traduction of science itself. For full fifty years every turn of the archæological spade has proven the moral dishonesty and scientific inaccuracy of Bible opponents. They once denied that Moses could write the Pentateuch, saying that writing did not exist in Moses' day. Then archæology brought up the Laws of Hammurabi, antedating Moses by 500 to 1,000 years. Defeated at that point, they shortly turned about and denied Moses himself, questioning whether such a man ever lived. Once more the turn of the spade put them to confusion, and brought out of the ancient archives of the earth the very name of the man whose existence they had disputed. And now the latest dodge of this indigenous infidelity is to insist that while Moses wrote some portions of the Pentateuch, there were many other writers who contributed, and the Pentateuch is only a composite, all of which they claim on the basis of "style" traced thru the intricacies of the text, assigning to one man every portion where the word "Yahveh" appears, and giving the author of that part as "J"; and wherever Elohim is found, they affirm a second author and call him "E"; and wherever anything priestly appears they put down "P" for a third author, etc.

When 4,000 years from now, the living critics

exhume the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis and find my library, they will take my books and prove that they are composites. Wherever I speak of God, they will find one author and name him "G"; wherever I speak of the Heavenly Father, they will find another author and call him "H. F."; wherever I call him Lord, they will find a third author and name him "L" and wherever I speak of Christ, they will name a fourth author "C"; and they will have the exact same basis to prove that my books were produced by four men that they have applied to the composite theory of the Pentateuch.

The persistence of these men in the face of rebuffs received from facts unearthed by archæology, almost proves a predetermined infidelity. They once denied the historical existence of any such four kings as were reported to have captured Lot, but archæology uncovered the entire quartette. They once denied that bricks could be made without straw, but Prof. Coburn went to Egypt and dug and carried away with his own hands, bricks proving absolutely the use of straw at first, stubble later, and finally roots and sticks.

The attempt is even yet made to deny the Exodus of Israel from Egypt and the migration of that nation into Canaan, but a tablet of the time of Menepthah II, the Pharaoh of the Exodus, bearing the name of "Israel" is a secular testimony to Sacred Writ. They have exhumed portraits of the kind of Canaanitish soldiers that disputed with Joshua the occupation of the Promised Land. They

once denied that there was any such a king as Belshazzar reigning in Daniel's day, but later the testimony of the rocks told the story of Nabonidus, the real king, and of Belshazzar, the co-regent son.

In fact, one can multiply these instances to an extent that only the unwilling will remain unbelieving.

Prof. Ira Price of the University of Chicago, a student of Semitic languages and an archæologist of world fame, after rehearsing instance upon instance, concludes, "These records, chiseled in adamantine volumes, stamped in imperishable clay, painted in the darkness of the tombs, or cut on mountain side, bring impartial, unimpeachable and conclusive proof of the veracity of the Old Testament."

Before I pass from this subject, however, I must make mention of another, namely, the notion that our text is unclean, corrupt, by compilations, transcriptions, translations, etc.

The indictment involves an exploded falsehood. Not only were these books given direct to man from God, written down immediately upon their receipt by the man who received the revelation, but the law of the Scribes forbade any change whatever in the process of copying, and from time immemorial, demanded the painstaking in handling the text that proves as positively the Divine preservation as the text itself positively asserts the Divine inspiration. The slightest defects in a synagogue roll vitiated the same. Even the blurring of letters brought about by the reverent kissing of

the opening and closing words of the portion to be read, condemned a document. They not only took the utmost pains in transcribing what was said, they had to make the letters exactly the same in size and character; the lines the same in length. In fact, one manuscript had to be a facsimile reproduction of the original. So careful were these copyists that they counted the words and letters, the points and accents, chapter by chapter, thru the entire volume, and like a modern accountant, effected a "trial balance" for every page and line of the book. This rendered false translations, interpolations, accretions, subtractions practically impossible. It remained the special privilege of the skeptical—Jehoiakim among the ancients, and Prof. Kent among the moderns—to take away from the Bible and thereby effect the sacrilege of attempted substitution.

Concerning the New Testament, the case of Divinity in origin and preservation is stronger still. Harnack, the destructive critic, has to consent that the four Gospels belong to the 1st Century, and that the book of the Acts is a companion piece. Paul looms too large in history for any intelligent man to dispute either his existence or his authorship and as for John and the Revelation, we have the writings of his disciples extant, witnessing alike to his personality and his production.

Its enemies themselves being witnesses, there is not a New Testament book nor yet a New Testament author named whose inspiration has been successfully disputed.

The claim of inspiration has around about it the body of Christ—The Church. That institution must be accounted for, and the Bible alone provides an explanation. Its 20 centuries of challenging, conquering history demand interpretation.

As Arthur Pierson said, "The little army of Jesus with no badges or banner, no weapon but truth and no force but persuasion, in the face of the fearful persecutions grew mightier year by year. The blood of the martyrs was the seed of the new churches and fell, like fertilizing dew, on a barren soil. * * The gospel overcame evil with good. Gathering strength like volcanic fires beneath the surface, it heaved social life like an earthquake, bringing to the dust its palaces of iniquity and its thrones of regal wrong."

Walter Rausenbusch, a destructive critic, said of it, "It has lifted woman to equality and companionship with man; secured the sanctity and stability of marriage; changed parental despotism to parental service; eliminated unnatural vice; the abandonment of children, blood revenge, and the robbery of the ship-wrecked from the customs of Christian nations. It has abolished slavery, mitigated war, covered all lands with a network of charities to uplift the poor and the fallen, fostered the institutions of education, aided the progress of civil liberty and social justice, and diffused a softening tenderness throughout human life. It has done all that and vastly more", and if you ask "How?" the answer is to be found in a single sentence and the only sentence that has any meaning whatever, namely:

"It has given the world a Bible", and out of that Book has blossomed every blessing, personal, social or national, known to man.

Who can believe that such streams will flow from an uninspired fountain?

But I turn from this question to

THE WEIGHT OF EVIDENCE

confidently affirming that it is with the claims of inspiration and against the theory of evolution.

The conceptions of the Bible favor inspiration vs. evolution. In evolution, we commence with the monad and propose to end with the superman. I beg pardon, let me be uptodate—we begin with an electron and propose to finish with a Weismann. In the intellectual realm, we commence with the primitive thought of an ape, and progress to the scientific attainments of a Chicago University professor. Personally, I am willing to concede, with them, there may be progress between these two points.

But I must turn about to call attention to the fact that the Bible no more commences with an ape idea than it ends with a Chicago University professor's conclusions.

On the other hand, the Bible begins and ends on a plane so lofty that only inspiration can explain the height to which it rises or the flight in which it is sustained.

Take, for instance, the opening sentence of the Bible—"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth". Nothing more true, nothing more

majestic, nothing more lofty has ever found expression in human speech. Joseph Parker says, "As a mere sentence, it cannot be exceeded in grandeur. As a conjecture, no addition can be made to its sublimity. As a true voice from eternity, it cannot be charged with apology or incertitude". The candid consideration of this opening sentence of the Bible, its antiquity considered, would convince any unprejudiced student that it was "the Word of God" and not of man; the acme of inspiration and not the electron of evolution!

The anticipations of the Bible positively prove inspiration vs. evolution. A. J. Gordon said, "Prophecy is the mould of history". If so, we have in prophetic fulfilments a scientific demonstration of inspiration. Here we come upon a wealth of argument the weight of which is as irresistible as would be an avalanche sweeping the sides of Mt. Everest.

The comparatively minor sentences of prophecy that majored in history, who can measure? Noah received from God a prophecy, "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem and Canaan shall be his servant". That prophecy was not only literally fulfilled, but to this day holds at every point. In the book of Deuteronomy we read of Israel, "Ye shall be plucked from the land. The Lord shall scatter ye among all people. Among these nations thou shalt find no ease". Every man

who knows aught of the Jew knows that that prophecy finds in history a literal fulfilment.

Zephaniah wrote, "I will make Nineveh a desolation". The words find literal fulfilment. Of the city of Babylon, in the day of its surpassing glory, it was written, "Babylon shall become heaps. Wild beasts of the island shall dwell there and owls. It shall be no more inhabited forever", and it has taken place even as promised. Jesus looked on Jerusalem and declared its coming destruction. Descending to very minutae of speech, He said, "Not one stone of the temple shall be left upon another". Forty years later it was so! Daniel in the second chapter of his book prophesied an outline of history, from which 27 centuries have departed in no particular!

But to show how the prophets could express even the very particulars of an incident, remind yourself of Zachariah's statement concerning the Christ who was to come, "He shall ride into Jerusalem upon a colt, the foal of an ass"—a sentence that waited 700 years for its fulfilment and at the end of that time saw the last word of the assertion realized. Time and space forbid that I attempt the exhaustion of this source of witnesses, but to show how potent is the argument, only remember that prophecies concerning the Christ begin in the 3rd chapter of Genesis and conclude with the 22nd of Revelation, and only those have failed to find the forms of history that remain for certain fulfilment. "The seed of woman" was to bruise the serpent's head; a "Virgin was to conceive and bear a son";

"His name was to be called Immanuel"; He was to be a child born; "a son given"; "a Counsellor"; "A Mighty God"; "A Prince of Peace"; "an Everlasting Father"; "the lily of the valley"; "the rose of Sharon"; "the Branch"; "The Lord our righteousness"; "the man of God's right hand"; "the man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" "the son of Abraham"; "son of David"; "Son of Man"; "Son of God"; "King of the Jews"; "King of Israel"; "Lord of Lords"; "Second man"; "the last Adam"; "the first and the last"; "the beginning and the ending"; "the way, the truth and the life"; "the Light of the World"—and such He is, and such He was, and such He will ever remain. It was prophesied that He would lay down His life for the people, but it was also prophesied that on the third day He should rise again. It was prophesied that He should ascend into the heavens. All those prophecies were long since converted into history.

What other religion can point to such proofs of divinity? What other Book can bring such a certificate of its inspiration?

The total character of the Book demands inspiration vs. evolution. I have spoken of THE BOOK, and such it is. Some one says, "No, it is a library! It is 66 books"? Yes! "written by 40 authors"? Yes! "Produced in a period equalling if not exceeding 1500 years"? Yes! "By men, many of whom never met each other or heard one of another". Yes! And yet we find it *one* book. The unity of the Scripture is an evidence of its divinity. Its authors lived in different countries; were affected

by different circumstances; spoke different languages; employed diversities of literary style; represented all grades of culture, and yet from Moses to Malachi, the Old Testament moves without a break, and from Matthew to Revelation, the New proceeds without an hiatus. Not one of the 66 is in conflict with another. Yea, more, not one of the 66 but produces an essential part of the glorious whole and so fits what he has to say into the consummation, as to complete and perfect it.

Some one has said, "The Old Testament is patent in the New, and the New is latent in the Old" and yet "while there is no collision between the writers, neither is there any evidence of collusion".

I cannot help contrasting all this with my recent readings in the realm of "assured knowledge", "certified science", for I have just been reading Darwin, Weismann, LaMarck, Mendel, Haeckel, Osborn, Conklin and others. No two of them are in agreement. While they hold in a general way to a basal theory, at every single point where they attempt its explanation, they part company. The reason is not far to seek! These uninspired men are dealing in a series of "suppositions", while the Biblical writers are themselves the subjects of inspiration. Their speech is the model of the centuries; their themes are the most lofty; their discussions the most intelligent, their conclusions the most unanswerable.

The proposal of Mr. H. G. Wells to provide a new Bible will produce in the thinking world only

derision and scorn. Men know that our Bible cannot be improved upon. Yea, better, they know full well it will never again be equalled. The great Joseph Parker sanely asked, "Can any man add one true line to the moral or spiritual code of the Scripture? Can any man publish an appendix of omitted morals? Can any man add to the tender balms and solaces provided in the Bible for broken hearts and wounded spirits?" Is there a point at which you can provide a solitary jot or tittle to its teaching that would prove to the world of profit? If not, why make a mock of the master-piece of the ages? If not, why neglect the Book of books? If not, why shut the ears against sentences that are so clearly from God? If not, why sit at the feet of men and permit them, in your presence, to scorn its evident divinity? If not, why not accept it as the basis for life building, as the Pole Star for life's direction, and as the source of information concerning the life that is to come?

Note—For a fuller discussion of this subject, read Prof. Leander Keyser on "Contending for the Faith" an admirable and an adequate volume.

CHAPTER II

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION— DOES IT TEND TO ATHEISM?

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION— DOES IT TEND TO ATHEISM?

"The wicked, thru the pride of his countenance, will not seek after God. God is not in all his thoughts." Psa. 10:4.

THE custom of selecting severe texts with which to sting one's intellectual opponents, is hardly praiseworthy, if even it be pardonable. I should treat this text with more pleasure if it did not open with the words **"the wicked"**, since I am not at all disposed to bring any railing against the men whose "new" religion is so plain a departure from the old paths. But not believing in the right of the individual to either make Scripture to suit himself or even change it into acceptable terms, I must take the text as I find it and treat it in the light of our theme—"The Theory of Evolution, Does It Tend to Atheism?"

The reasons for its selection will appear as we progress with this discussion. Beyond doubt, the intelligent traveler takes note, not alone of the character of the path his feet may be treading, but inquires deliberately "Whither?"

I was lost, once, in the deep woods of northern Minnesota. I spent weary hours in a foot-sore journey; groped my way thru the blackest night I have ever known, and faced all the while the fury of storm and rain, and it all came about in consequence of taking a path that looked attractive but led me astray. This is a parable and raises the question, "Whither does this evolutionary path tend?"

Turning back to the text and ignoring its opening indictment, I call attention to the points of parallelism between the remaining portions and that now popular theory known as Evolution. There are three: Pride of Intellect; Practical Irreligion, and Potential Atheism.

PRIDE OF INTELLECT.

"The wicked thru the pride of his countenance". The word "countenance" here refers not so much to the pride some people have in beholding themselves in a mirror, as it suggests and symbolizes self-esteem. Joseph Parker says, "It refers literally to the heightening of the nostril, the lifting of the head".

In the study of this suggestion, therefore, three important points, at which the pride of intellect now expresses itself.

This century is seeing a revival of the original temptation. When Satan tempted our first mother to disobedience, he did it by the subtle promise of "wisdom". "Then your eyes shall be opened and ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil; and when the woman saw that it was a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat". Beyond all doubt, there is a progress in the temptation recorded in Genesis. The first appeal was to the lust of the flesh, "good for food"; the second to the lust of the eye, "pleasant to the eyes"; the third to the pride of life, "a tree to be desired to make one wise", and it was at this third point that Satan reached the acme of his

machinations! Great as is the temptation in the lust of the flesh, subtle as is the entreaty of pleasure for the eye, more powerful still is the appeal in the prospect of wisdom!

Each century, in turn, adopts a shibboleth and yields willing obedience to the ideal thereby expressed. The Twentieth Century has chosen "**Scholarship**" and that word has become both its religion and its god. In Germany they may name it "Kultur"; in England they may call it "Science"; in America they may phrase it "Scholarship", but in each country it represents the same claim, namely, "Wisdom is with **us**"!

This conceit is described by one writer as a result of the invention "of certain mechanical contrivances for abolishing time and space" and "expresses an inordinate but unjustifiable vanity". Practically every book now written by a modernist is big with such phrases as "the sure results of science", "the scholarship of the century", "the intellectual attainments of the times", "the fine products of university education", "the wondrous wisdom of the days", etc. It is a contagious claim and intellectually anemic men are particularly subject to the infection. One sound reason for the most thoro education exists at this point. Men of mediocre endowment, or only partial training are particularly tempted at this point! This accounts for the false claims of classical learning where little or none of the same exists; the frenzied endeavor to secure literary degrees where no merit warrants the granting of the same, the keen candidacy for

college and university professorships without peculiar fitness, and the impetuous rush to the printing press with every immature or amateur expression of thought! Satan has again triumphed and has taken us with ease by the hint **"Be wise"!**

Science is now the subtle word of Satanic employment. It is a word that expresses the idea "I know" and so sums up in a single term the conceit of the age. To immature minds, Science, as now employed, seems to be synonymous with Omniscience. To call a thing "scientific" is, in the judgment of such deceived ones, to establish it forever. That may account for the fact that we no longer have books on Biology, on History, on Philosophy, on Religion, but we are taught "the Science of Biology," "the Science of History," "the Science of Philosophy," "the Science of Religion," and we have so far converted this word into a mere mental commodity that a designing woman employs it for purely commercial purposes by calling her mental vaporings "Christian Science", and multitudes are deceived thereby.

We have had books written recently on "The Descent of Man". We are sadly in need of a volume on "The Degradation of Words", and central in that discussion would be the strange and unjustifiable uses to which this word "Science" is now being subjected. O! Great and good word! but so bandied about by designing men as to be, like its Master, marred past recognition. What crimes against intelligence are committed in thy name Oh Science! This also is Satan's work!

The prospect of becoming gods is still a potent appeal. "Ye shall be as gods". No wonder our first mother went down before it! No wonder our first father fell for it! Nor is it any wonder their children, (born not only in this sin but of it), should surrender at the same point.

A few days since in an evangelical ministers' meeting, a man decried the old philosophy that we are "sinners" as an idea wholly out of date, and as most unworthy our matchless, manly dignity. To his brethren he said, "We are gods! Let us not forget the great apostle's teaching, 'Ye also are His offspring;' forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to talk continuously in the terms of humility, but rather in those of self-appreciation and praise"!

The speaker evidently forgot two things; 1st, that Paul was quoting from heathen poets when he made that declaration; and second, that when certain men at Lystra, seeing a miracle wrought at his hands upon an impotent one, brought oxen and garlands and would have done sacrifice to Barnabas as Jupiter and Paul as Mercury, they rent their clothes and ran in among the people, crying out "Why do ye these things? We are also men of like passions with you and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God who made heaven and earth and the sea and all that in them is". (Acts 14:11-15.)

A few years since, when Reginald Campbell attained the zenith of public attention by the explosion of his own faith, we paid much heed to what

he had to say; now that he has fallen back to the nadir of obscurity we are like to forget his pretentious claims, "My God is my deeper self"!

Nietzsche, who in the judgment of Prof. Williams of Oxford, was the greatest exponent of evolution known to the age, said "Egoism is the prime characteristic of the noble soul"! If the Pharisee of the New Testament who went into the Temple to pray, were alive now, he would receive the commendation of all evolutionists and be an accepted leader among the "New Theologians". The superman, prophesied by so-called modern science, is nothing more nor less than a repetition of Satan's garden triumph; and again the sons of Adam are delighting themselves in the taste of forbidden fruit, tempted to it by the lie, "Ye shall be as gods".

Passing from the first sentence of the text to the second, we go from cause to effect. It may be properly phrased

PRACTICAL IRRELIGION.

"He will not seek God"! The whole tendency of evolution takes one away from faith in God and in the end, even denies the fact of God.

The theory proposes to explain all things apart from God. Thos. Carlyle, the great English historian and essayist, and rugged thinker, said of Darwin, "I have known three generations of Darwins, grandfather, father and son, atheists all. The brother of the famous naturalist, a quiet man, who lives not far from here, told me that among his grandfather's effects he found a seal engraven with

this legend, 'Omni ex conchis' (everything from a clam shell). I saw the naturalist not many months ago, told him that I read his 'Origin of Species' and other books; that he had by no means satisfied me that we were descended from monkeys, but had gone far to persuade me that he and his so-called scientific brethren had brought the present generation very near to monkeys.

A good sort of man is this Darwin, and well meaning, but with a very little intellect. It is a sad and terrible thing to see nigh a whole generation of men and women, professing to be cultivated, looking around in purblind fashion, and finding no God in the universe. I suppose it is a reaction from the reign of cant and hollow pretense, professing to believe what in fact they do not believe. And this is what we have got to—all things from frog spawn—the GOSPEL OF DIRT.

Henry Van Dyke, in "The Gospel for an Age of Doubt", institutes a comparison between the genealogy of man as recorded in Luke's gospel, and that created by evolution. He admits having reduced Lyman Abbott's description of the descent, but says "I have retained its every essential" and then recites: "Monera began Amoebae, Amoebae began Synamoebae; Synamoebae, began Ciliated Larva; Ciliated Larva began primeval Stomach Animals; Primeval Stomach Animals begat Gliding Worms; Gliding Worms begat Soft Worms; Soft Worms begat Sack Worms; Sack Worms begat Skull-less Animals; Skull-less Animals begat Single-Nostrilled Animals: Single-Nostrilled Animals

Begat Primeval Fish; Primeval Fish begat Mud Fish; Mud Fish begat Gilled Amphibians; Gilled Amphibians begat Tailed Amphibians; Tailed Amphibians begat Primeval Amniota; Primeval Amniota begat Primary Mammals; Primary Mammals begat Pouched Animals; Pouched Animals begat Semi-apes; Semi-apes begat Tailed apes; Tailed apes begat Man-like apes; Man-like Apes begat Ape-like men; Ape-like Men begat Men". And now the Dean of a Divinity School completes the chain by "the inclusion of Jesus"!

One does not wonder that you hold such a suggestion in ridicule and contempt, but I ask you to pause before it long enough to compare it with the origin of man as recorded in the Blessed Book. "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli, which was the son of Matthat, which was the son of Levi, * * * * which was the son of Nathan, which was the son of David which was the son of Jesse, which was the son of Obed, which was the son of Boaz, which was the son of Salmon, * * * * which was the son of Phares, which was the son of Judah, which was the son of Jacob, which was the son of Isaac, which was the son of Abraham, which was the son of Thara, which was the son of Nachor * * * * which was the son of Arphaxad, which was the son of Sem, which was the son of Noe, which was the son of Lamech, which was the son of Mathusala, which was the son of Enoch, which was the son of Jared, which was the son of Male-

leel, which was the son of Cainan, which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God". (Luke 3:23-38.)

The first of these trees makes man the product of a blind force, named "spontaneous generation" and gives him a slime sink for origin and an animal ancestry; the second makes him the creature and child of the Most High. Without now attempting to settle which is the saner view, or which holds the more certain truth, I cite them to prove the absolute correctness of the text, namely the evolutionist will not acknowledge God!

The appeal of evolution is to worship creation vs. the Creator. Kant, whose philosophy conformed with the Darwin theory, acknowledged no allegiance to a personal Creator, but confessed that he felt "a reverence approaching worship" for "the starry heavens above" and "the inner consciousness of man", or in other words, for the creation and creature, but none whatever for the Creator. In fact the existence of a Creator is practically denied. Hear the Darwinist—"Science is everywhere using impersonal ideas in explaining the universe" * *. "The idea of creation has been merged in the vaguer conceptions of evolution", says Gerald Birney Smith, the evolutionist professor of Chicago University.

Once more the "modernist" has returned to the old pagan pantheism, and speaks of God as "a spirit working within the cosmos". Prof. McGiffert and other evolutionists, tell us that "the divine is

no more separate and aloof. It is within and organic with the human", and another further remarks, "God is considered as the soul of the world; the spirit animating nature; the universal force which takes the myriad forms of heat, light, gravity, electricity and the like". If, therefore, these men are correct, the ancient heathen who worshipped the sun, moon and stars really bowed before the only god, and for that matter, the modern heathen who worships wood, stones and even serpents is still worshipping some expression of the only god there is. To say that such a god is not the God of the Christian, and that he is thoroly unknown to Biblical conceptions, is to state a spiritual axiom.

The evolution-propaganda promotes both these procedures. To the evolutionist, Christianity is little more sacred than any ancient Greek cult. Matthew Arnold, while professing to find in Christ "the Light of the World," was a modernist with all its implications, and in one of his poems he writes:

"Forgive me, masters of the mind,
At whose behest I long ago
So much unlearned, so much resigned;
I come not here to be your foe;
I seek these anchorites, not in ruth,
To curse and to deny your truth;
Not as their friend, or child, I speak,
But as on some far northern strand,
Thinking of his own gods, a Greek,
In pity and mournful awe might stand
Before a fallen Runic stone,—
For both were faiths, and both are gone".

What then is the conclusion of the whole matter,

other than that which is expressed in the last sentence of our text—

POTENTIAL ATHEISM!

"God is not in all their thoughts."

The greater exponents of evolution have been unbelievers. If we thought anyone would attempt to debate this we would call the roll again, quote from their writings and prove the statement. I am not saying these men have no god; I am saying that few of them recognize the God of the Bible, or regard the teachings of that Book as final and authoritative.

They might resent being called "atheists" but under the most favorable conditions could not claim to be Christian believers. One wonders if that is not a prime reason why their so-called sciences remain mere speculations, hypotheses, theories, and no more. One cannot escape the conviction that no man can come into any light who does not walk in His light and in the light of the Word. Has it not occurred to you that all the fixed sciences, about which men no longer debate, were discovered and proven and exploited by believers? The Copernican theory of the Universe is no longer a controversy, but Copernicus, while a Papist, was an ardent believer in both God and His book, and the very breath of his childhood was that of the bishop's house. Kepler, in his early days, was a theological student whose scientific tendencies and attainments triumphed over his gospel ministry, but were exercised in the same unfaltering faith and Kepler

found in Science the thoughts of God. Galileo, the father of physics, while suffering from the church, remained faithful, as he believed, to the God of the Bible and the Bible of God. Sir Isaac Newton, whose theories were long since changed into certainties, was the stepson of a preacher and a patron of the faith once for all delivered. Henry Van Dyke says, "We observe in those departments of science where the knowledge of the magnitude and splendid order of the physical universe is most clear and exact, the most illustrious men have not been skeptics but sincere and steadfast believers" and then he gives a list of the most brilliant mathematicians ever assembled, and says they were believers, every one.

I am inclined to think that their Science was accurate because they were believers. "The light is with Him". How strange that not only were established sciences discovered every one by believers but even the opinions of such later believers, working in the scientific realm, as Sir James and Alexander Simpson, George Stokes, Lord Kelvin, Pasteur, and their like, when contrasted with the pure suppositions and speculations of a sceptical Darwin, a doubting La Marcke, an unbelieving Spencer, an agnostic Huxley, a monist Haeckel, and a rationalist Weismann, are comparative certainties. At this moment Mendelism gives every promise of proving its contentions and forcing science to accept the creative theory of Genesis—"to each seed it is given to bring forth after its kind", and Gregor Mendel was a godly monk.

Converts to the theory of evolution are almost without exception destructive critics. Those ministers who have received this Darwinian supposition and dared to believe it a science, make up today a school of men who not only disturb the churches of God, papist and evangelical alike, but are the very men who are denying the veracity of the Book, disputing the Virgin Birth and Deity of Jesus, demanding that God be no longer an autocrat, but accept His position in a democracy—in fact, practically attempting His dethronement. When they become professors in universities and theological seminaries, their influence is a bitter fruit. O. B. Server, in "The Bible Champion" cites many instances in proof of this position. In one theological seminary a certain young student had invited ten of his fellows to come to his room for a prayer meeting. Not one of them accepted, and the last one exclaimed, "Pray? I haven't anyone to pray to"! Those who have quit these seminaries and at the same time disclaimed their call to preach, and deliberately accepted other callings or professions, are a legion, and in every instance it was due to what they received from instructors, who were Darwin devotees.

My own associate in the ministry was in a class of sixteen. He sat at the feet of a now famed Yale theological professor, and widely known as a "new" theologian and evolutionist. Eight of the sixteen accepted his evolutionary hypothesis and went with him the length of all its conclusions. The entire eight left the ministry. Other members of the

class repudiated it, and now represent an effective preaching force.

It is reported (on one of our mission fields,) a Union Christian College (so-called) sent out twenty six graduates. One of them went into the ministry and twenty five relapsed into the dark unfaith of heathenism.

A young woman teacher in the public schools and a valued church worker, went to Chicago University to study to fit herself for her vocation. That was the end of her church usefulness, and Mr. Server says, "She seemed to have attended a slaughter house of faith and a morgue of piety".

I could, out of personal observation, cite scores of instances, met in my travels across the continent, of young men who have pitifully reported to me the waning of their faith and the wreck of their ministry thru the acceptance of the evolutionary theory. Is it any wonder when their theological professors, following this philosophy, have affirmed in their presence "In the light of our comparative historical study, any claim to exclusiveness and incomparableness on the part of Christianity, as a positive religion, must be entirely abandoned"?

Some of these instructors have sought to quiet the fears and assuage the griefs of parents, bereft by the unbelief of their children, saying, "We teach here theistic evolution"! It is a poor sop "which", as Prof. George McCready Price justly says, "is in its essential nature as thoroly pagan or heathen as anything that ever grew up in Greece or India".

Then let us come to the conclusion of the whole matter.

The entire tendency of this theory is to atheism. Multitudes of its followers will not admit so much. They maintain they have a god. Possibly; the god of a Huxley,—unknown and unknowable. Possibly; the god of Haeckel, an insentient force, unconsciously framing and finishing. Possibly; the god of a Coe, a Rauschenbusch, a Frank Crane,—who has played the aristocrat long enough and must now descend to his proper place "in a democracy"; but to this whole company, the God of the Bible is unknown. "He is not in all their thoughts", and their attempt to rule Him out is no longer even disguised.

On their own confession, the authority of our faith has perished, and the sacred convictions of past centuries have been swept forever away. They no longer believe in our God; they no longer believe in an infallible Bible; they no longer believe in the Virgin Birth of Christ or any other essential feature of His deity; they hold to ridicule the personality and power of the Holy Ghost; they define regeneration as "adolescence"; they reduce evangelization to "social uplift"; they think of mission work in terms of "international commerce" and "educational opportunity"; they look upon the church as a mere medium of financing their evolutionary program! The sacred codes of Scripture are to them only social conceptions strengthened by some centuries of practice; marriage is a domestic convenience, but holds no moral obligations;

the Sabbath is little less than a social nuisance, and sobriety, imposed by law, violates every principle of that progressive theory "The survival of the fittest".

What will be the final result? You say, "No man can forecast it". Any intelligent man can rehearse it. There is nothing new under the sun. 150 years ago France disposed of the true church, massacring Protestants in multitudes; 150 years ago France repudiated the Bible; 150 years ago France dethroned God and, impersonating Human Reason, Liberty, Equality and Fraternity in a street strumpet, rid itself of all the restraints with which the Bible had ever sought to bind it. Then what? As one has said, "Her flourishing manufacturing cities fell into decay; her fertile districts returned to native wildness; a period of moral and intellectual decadence ensued, and the whole nation plunged by a swift descent to the bloody abyss of the revolution by the way of anarchy, ruin and the Reign of Terror".

Think you it will be different this time? I tell you, Nay! The doctrine of Charles Darwin, in proportion as it dominates the future, the theory of evolution to the extent of its final acceptance, will make the recent baptism of blood, brought on by Nietzsche and Treitschke under the domination of that biological theory, as compared with the baptism yet to come, as a local shower to the flood that will prevail over every mountain.

"The survival of the fittest" is a soft sounding phrase, but when it is interpreted in the light of

"the struggle for existence", it becomes a startling menace. Fill a nation with the German conceit that "We are the superior race, and all the women of weaker nations are our natural prey, and the men of such nations our legitimate servants", and you turn the world into a slaughter house, and, as one has said, "There is no logic to show why such a code of international ruffianism is wrong or at all blame-worthy if the evolution theory be true". Its premises granted, an Armageddon is the result. I am no alarmist, but I am not blind! The triumph of Darwinism would introduce the day of the Great Tribulation!

NOTE—For a fuller discussion of this subject read "Christianity and Anti-Christianity" by S. J. Andrews.

CHAPTER III

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION—DOES IT TEND TO ANARCHY?

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION— DOES IT TEND TO ANARCHY?

IN discussing this subject we invite attention to 2 Peter 2:1-12.

The greatest single wonder of the Bible exists in the circumstances that it compasses every vital subject and when it finishes with a theme, has spoken the sanest word that will ever be uttered concerning the same.

If Peter were a living prophet, we suspect that the followers of Mr. Darwin would complain of this chapter as too personal, since they are the very men who have "denied the Lord that bought them" and who have been "followed by a multitude", and "by reason of whom the way of truth is now evil spoken of", and "who, with well turned words, have made merchandise of the people". The result of this is fully set forth in verses that follow, to the end of the chapter, and considered together, they provide a basis for the discussion of our theme.

There are three statements regarding Evolution around which we propose to build this discourse; The Evolutionary Hypothesis is Unproven; The Theory's Promises are Unfulfilled; and the Product of the Theory is Anarchy.

THE EVOLUTIONARY HYPOTHESIS IS UNPROVEN.

This is the charge of its opponents. It is a charge we will continue to make. In making it, we know we are on absolutely safe grounds and

we also know we are on scientific grounds. The attempt of Darwin devotees to make the appeal that every opponent of Evolution is opposing Science would be pathetic if a stronger word were not needed to describe it. These Darwin disciples know full well no well-educated man ever opposes true Science, or could by any conceivable debate be pushed into a position where he would ever appear to so do. Science, to us, is as sacred as the Son of God, for it is simply His way of work, and "without Him was not anything made that was made". Kepler, the great Christian believer, cried upon certain scientific discoveries, "O, I think God's thought after Him". So does every true scientist. But the work of such men is something more than multiplied suppositions, palmed off in the name of Science. The one effective appeal made to the great student body of America in this matter, rests upon an utter falsehood. It is most natural for young and inexperienced men and women to be ready to part company with those seniors, who are made to appear to oppose "search for truth". When the President of Darmouth College intimates that orthodox men believe in anything less than Science, and open-minded search for the truth, he states what every thoughtful man knows to be an utterly false charge, and when in defense of his position he quotes, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free", he lays himself open to the indictment of false assumption, since the man does not live who can declare the Evolutionary Theory to be true, and, at the same time, be himself speak-

ing the truth! The man who opposes Darwinism cannot be indicted with opposing Science.

This is the confession of the Darwinian advocates. We have been quoting from leading scientists to show that they either clearly admit no sufficient proofs of the Darwinian Theory, or openly oppose the same as utterly unscientific. We have used such names as Profs. Shaler and Everitt of Harvard, Lionel S. Beale of Kings College, London, Virchow of Berlin, Zoeckler of Griefswald, Fleischman of Erlangen, Dennart, Goette, Hoppe, Prof. Paulson of Berlin, and others. But to all of this the Evolutionists have answered, "They are men of ten or more years since. In that time our position has been shown to be scientific". Fortunately for the truth and unfortunately for this fallacious argument, Prof. William Bateson, the distinguished representative of Cambridge University, and confessedly the greatest living authority on the subject, now comes out in the great assembly of Scientists in Toronto and admits that discussions on Evolution are practically at an end; morphology and genetics have alike failed to yield any evidence. The changes once claimed were confessedly gratuitous. "Less and less was heard about evolution in genetical circles and now the topic was dropped. When a student in other sciences asks us what is now currently believed about the origin of species, we have no clear answer to give. Faith has given place to agnosticism". This is all the more remarkable a confession because made by a friend of the Evolutionary Theory, who had

followed his speculations to the point of practical despair.

This confession discredits both its scientific and social claims. When the scientists come back from their research and admit "We have exhausted every clue and have found no proofs", what absurdity for small men to go as gaily on as tho they had both leaders and light. It is a fresh illustration of the parable of our Lord. It is the foolish man, building his house once more upon the sand, and that in spite of the certainty that rains will descend and floods will come and winds will blow and beat upon that house and it will fall and great will be the fall of it.

No conclusion can be correct when the premises are utterly false. It is the reversal of logic to start with an unprovable hypothesis, and then state that "all known facts favor it". All the beneficial results promised by biological evolutionists, whether they were expected in the realm of plant life, animal life or human life, have excited only false hopes, and all expectations indulged as a consequence are doomed to disappointment. A lie, because you dress the same in the name of science, cannot produce desirable fruits. The philosophies of Hegel, Kant and Descartes were adopted by millions of men, but to this good hour not one blessed result has ever issued to the disciples of the same. The same principle will apply in Darwinism.

ITS PROMISES ARE DESTINED TO NO FULFILMENT.

It promised social improvement and it has only produced social putridity. That is the thing of which Peter is speaking in this chapter. Edmond Kelly, himself a Socialist, declares, "Socialism is not anarchism, but order; not communism but justice. It doesn't propose to abolish competition but to regulate it; not to abolish property but to consecrate it; not to abolish the home but to make the home possible". Such would be an evolution worth while, but when or where has any man ever seen a result of Evolutionary Socialism such as Kelly describes? More often the Michael Bakunin interpretation of Socialism has dominated. "Tear out of your hearts the belief in the existence of God. The first lie is God, the second lie is the idea of right. And when you have freed your minds of the fear of God and from the childish respect for right, then all the remaining chains that bind you, called civilization, property, marriage, morality, justice, will snap asunder like threads. Let your own happiness be your own law".

This is where Peter's words have their application. "Them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness and despise government. Presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities. * * * But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption. * *

Spots are they and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you; having eyes full of adultery and that cannot cease from sin; beguiling unstable souls; an heart they have exercised with covetous practices, cursed children, which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam, who loved the wages of unrighteousness. These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest, to whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever. For when they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure thru the lusts of the flesh, thru much wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error."

John Burroughs, the great naturalist, in a most informing article, published in the New York Times Current History, thinks that the Evolution Theory by "a long, slow and painful process, gives man his moral conscience, and his concepts of right and wrong, of truth and falsehood, justice and mercy; and that it amounted practically to a new birth, making the fittest to survive, and that thru it was modern salvation made possible." He argues, "Only by man subordinating the rule of might to the rule of right, fair dealing, the common weal, justice to the weak as well as to the strong, were the rights of states and organized governments possible".

But, we ask, what evidence there is that any of this ever came by the evolutionary process? I know the mountains of Kentucky at first hand, and have had a fair degree of familiarity with the mountain-

eers; the men among whom family feuds live and flourish. Only recently two parties to one of those famed feuds met in a Court Room where certain of their number were on trial for life, for having killed their opposing fellows. After some little time, they shook hands, wept on one another's shoulders, decided to bury the hatchet forever and go back to their homes to be law-abiding, peaceful citizens and recognize the brotherhood of man. Was that a result of a "long, slow and painful process of evolution?" Not at all! It came in consequence of a judge's appeal, who, animated himself by the Spirit of Christ, laid His great principles before these contestants and argued them so eloquently as to convince criminals of their crime, sinners of their sin. Never has even the rudiments of civilization resulted from the theory of Evolution!

Just as grafting a crab-apple tree makes it possible for the tree to bring forth pippins, by the introduction of a new life, finding expression in a new fruit, so wherever civilization has been at all lifted, improved, finished, it has been done, not by the cultivation of the old life, but by the introduction of new principles that made for progress; by the reaching down of a hand from above that laid hold and lifted. Civilization is not a product of Evolution. Civilization, wherever it is worthy of the name, is a pure product of Christianity. Take Christianity out of your civilization now and you will fall back, by an irresistible law, known in the language of science as "reversal to type", to paganism

first, heathenism afterwards, and finally to primitive brutalities and bestial behaviors.

Witness the high state of civilization once attained by the Aztecs and Mayas, and the lower and more degraded condition of the American aborigines upon the arrival of Columbus.

This is not only true in the social realm, but it is true in the realm of government as well.

The Evolution Theory promises true government, but eventuates in dethroning all government. Never since the world had a beginning has any proposition been more clearly demonstrated than this. Take the nations that have tried out evolutionary Socialism, and ask yourself today what one of them you would choose for a home. Into what one you would carry your family and feel any safety for it? Under what one of them you wish to make the purchase of property and look to that government for protection? Within the borders of what one would you like to bring up your babes? Hardly in Russia, where property rights are not regarded; where marriages are made and dissolved at will; where children are carried to brightly illuminated school buildings and by senior associates are led thru the dance until the early hours of the morning, while miserable mothers wait outside and beg to have their children come home, but are not allowed to exercise any authority whatever over them until many mothers are now saying, "There are no longer any children in Russia; only vicious little brutes, whose talk is only of money and pleasure".

If therefore the present rulership in Russia is ruthless, what can possibly be the character of that civil government when these children have come to its supremacy?

This theory promised personal liberty and produced social slavery. Here again the language of Peter is *a propos*. "While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption". "For of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage".

Take Tolstoi as a pitiable instance of this outworking. No man was ever so keen for liberty for himself and his fellow citizens. He sacrificed everything in behalf of its possible experience for his people, and signally failed, because of the social fabric of which he found himself a part, and failed also because his own theories, when they had their chance, refused to work. Finally, in order to be able to longer live, he took a single sentence from the lips of Jesus, "Resist not evil", and became an apostle of "passive resistance", and even at that saw the social slavery of his own country and people increasing until he counted himself a helpless victim of the same, and quitting his own family and house, sought the forest in which to die. This was his final and fruitless protest against a system that he himself had done more to popularize than any living Russian, for Tolstoi was a fellow-teacher with Proudhon, declaring "Property signifies that which has been given to me, which belongs to me exclusively, with which I can always do anything I like; which no one can take away from me;

which will remain with me to the end of my life, and precisely that which I am bound to use, increase and improve. Now there exists but one piece of such property for any man—himself". Following this philosophy to its natural conclusion, he disclaimed all property rights, refused his social standing, treated with contempt his hereditary titles, strove as seldom mortal man has ever striven, to extricate himself from state and social entanglements and by every turn wound himself into a new social slavery that produced only bitterness, despair and death. "While they promise liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption, for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought into bondage".

More than once Tolstoi turned to Christ, but just as often he turned away from Him. He took from Jesus what would fit his philosophy and what did not fit it, he refused, giving additional emphasis to Peter's language, "For if they have escaped the pollutions of the world thru the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning; for it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them". (Vss. 20-21.)

What I am saying is this, When Socialism has spoken its last word and the theory of Evolution has uttered its last promise, there is no prospect in either, apart from God and Christ. The sympa-

thetic writer may say, of Evolutionary Socialism, that "it has altruism as the basis of its philosophy, economics and ethics, and that by its anxiety to uplift, it comes into harmony with all that Christianity professes; that the fundamental ideas of anarchy, justice, liberty and equality, are ideals that the Christian also professes to love and to seek"; but he ought to know that when he makes the further remark, "Such ideals were prominent in the legislation of Moses and in the teachings of Jesus", he has missed the mark. All true ideals were **born** in the legislation of Moses and **have their being** in the teaching of Jesus, but that anarchy that disposes of God and puts a blind Force in His stead, as evolution does, and of Jesus Christ, as God's very Son, making Him nothing more than the beast brought to higher perfection, and of the Bible, holding it to be only an evolution of man's religious desires and experiences, has never yet produced a civilization worthy of the name, nor resulted in anything else than brutal ruffianism and never will!

To use the language of the same writer, but in a righteous sense, "All such expectations are iridescent dreams, contradicted by all human experience up to this very hour".

Finally, let the full truth be known.

THE PRODUCT OF THE EVOLUTION THEORY IS BESTIAL BOLSHEVISM!

The theory itself lays emphasis upon man's bestiality. To teach men they are brutes devel-

oped to higher form, and to bring them to be willing to claim kinship with the ape, is to belittle them in their own judgment. It cannot be otherwise. No man can have the same sense of dignity, once he is brought to believe he has come up from a lower form of life, that belongs, inherently, in the one who lets the Bible teach him the truth, namely that he is the highest product of the Divine wisdom and plan, and the perfection of all God's thought in perfecting and peopling a world. Peter never heard of Charles Darwin, but the Holy Spirit who indited his sentences knew perfectly well how to contrast angels, who in their higher origin and fellowship with God the Father, brought no railing accusation against heavenly dignities, and man, claiming kinship with natural brute beasts who hesitates not to speak evil of the same, nor yet to despise government.

It is a significant thing when White, the Socialist preacher of New York, and the socialist graduate of a Darwinian and liberal theological seminary, declares that he got the dynamite with which he hopes to destroy the present order from his instruction in the halls of the same. He thus reveals one of the true danger points not only to America, nor yet to our democratic government, but to the cause of Christianity itself—the Evolution Seminary!

This whole vulgar theory tempts the virtuous to fresh vulgarities. The strangest of modern spectacles is the sight of capped and gowned men, drawing salaries from tax payers or benevolently inclined persons, turning people from the knowledge

of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, to entangle them again in Hegelian, Marxian and Darwinian philosophies. The result of this we are beginning to see, and more of it we will face when the future has become the present. John Burroughs is a notable scientist, an ardent believer in Darwinism, and yet John Burroughs admits that the Germans, by the adoption of this very philosophy became a menace to the world. Of them he writes in perfect line with Darwin's philosophy which they adopted, of the "struggle for existence" and "the survival of the fittest", "They are the fittest to survive by reason of sheer power; they are the least fit by reason of sheer brutality—their reliance upon the predatory methods and the lower aims of earlier times. They have gone forth to battle in the spirit of their ancestral Huns, and in many ways in a worse spirit. * * * Wreckers of cathedrals, destroyers of libraries, despoilers of cemeteries, slayers of old men and women and children and priests and nuns, barbarians by instinct, pirates and incendiaries by practice, terrorists by training, slaves by habit and bullies by profession, void of humility, void of spirituality, resourceful but not inventive, thoro but not original, docile as individuals but brazen and defiant as a nation—ravishing, maiming, poisoning, burning, suffocating, deporting, enslaving, murderers of the very soul of a people, so far as it is in their power—the rest of the world can live on terms of peace and goodwill with them only after they have drained to the dregs the bitter cup of military defeat".

It all comes to what, then? Namely this, that **That theory tends to send Society to the sow-wallow of sin.** Pardon the language, but I bring it from the Apostle Peter. "But it is happened unto them, according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire". Vs. 22.

That is where the Bakunin philosophy comes in, dethroning God, denying the difference between right and wrong, destroying the family, leaving not an ark of rescue for one atom of a world consecrated to destruction. Perhaps never, since the days when the flood fell upon the face of the earth, were there so many nations away from God as now, and beyond all question, the one philosophy that has derided the codes of Bible morals and religion alike, that has decried the claims of Christ to deity and has abolished once and forever all external authorities, is the Evolution Theory.

When, therefore, men in society, march their way thru the world, kicking aside every single tenet of law, it will result in a godless world that will make unto itself graven images and by bowing itself to them, go back to the heathenism of the past; that will take the name of the Lord God in vain, for the purpose of showing their contempt of such a term; that will trample the Sabbath day under its feet in order to prove its disrespect for any expression of law; that will refuse honor to father and mother on the ground that the family is not a divine institution and parenthood imposes no obligations; that will kill; that will commit adultery

without conscience because the law against the same was only made sacred by Capitalism; that will steal without conviction of sin, since personal property rights were never sacred; and that will take from neighbor house or wife or servant or beast, if he be able, on the sole ground that "in the struggle for existence" only the stronger have rights that are to be regarded. Is Peter's language too strong? Is there any longer any doubt as to the relation between Evolution and Anarchy?

NOTE: For a fuller discussion of this subject read Prof. Geo. McCready Price on "Poisoning Democracy".

CHAPTER IV.

CIVILIZATION—IS IT AN EVOLUTION?

CIVILIZATION—IS IT AN EVOLUTION?

THERE are men, not a few, and college professors and modernist preachers out of number, who imagine that to raise such a question as this is to prove one's absurdity, if not insanity. But a worthy judgment of all questions is more easily passed after the arguments are in than before they are presented.

For the present, therefore, I ask you to withhold judgment and to give audience.

It might be well also to further remark that I am not alone in raising this question, nor am I left merely to the fellowship of a few unschooled laymen or rabidly orthodox ministers. Before I finish, I shall be able to abundantly prove that this question is in debate by the best known scientists, and I expect to compel even ardent evolutionists to make the most damaging admissions in the matter!

There are conservative men who tell us that it is folly to attempt to harmonize science and Scripture, and that our business is to present the Scriptures and ignore the whole subject of science. We may be pardoned for refusing to adopt this idea, for to us such an argument ignores the distinction between "science falsely so-called" and "knowledge gained and verified". If we believed the latter to be out of harmony with the Bible, our confidence in the Book itself would be shaken.

A popular discussion of this subject is bound to involve at least three related themes: The Genesis

of Man, the Rise of Civilization, and the History of Religion.

THE GENESIS OF MAN.

There are certain fundamental truths that must be regarded in the discussion of this subject and some of them run counter to current theories. Three of these we will now set in order concerning the genesis of Man.

1. He is of Divine and not of animal origin.

2. He is a direct creation and not a natural evolution.

3. His spiritual nature is proof of his supernatural origin.

1. He is of Divine and not of animal origin. The assumption of many so-called science teachers that "man is of animal origin" is justified by no facts. In the millenniums of human history, the world has never been treated to such a brew of unproven suppositions, wild speculations, imaginary conclusions and unwarranted statements as can be found in much of the current literature of this moment upon the subject of "man's origin." In all probability, nine out of ten of the text books used in the State Universities at this hour, in the State Normal Schools and in the High Schools, if they touch this subject at all, proceed upon the unproven and unprovable hypothesis of man's animal origin.

A more unscientific production than Chapin's "Social Evolution" never found place in print, and the creatures of the imagination with which that

volume is illustrated would do credit to the exaggerations of a Baron Munchausen, and prove how far godless unbelievers such as Birkner, Forrer, Schnug, McGregor and others will go in a mad endeavor to disprove the plain statements of Scripture and history's clear testimony as to the origin of Man.

We need not be surprised to find it so when we recall the fact that the authors of this idea were skeptics, every one, and "like produces like". Darwin and Huxley were agnostics; Haeckel was an atheist if ever one existed. Haeckel tells us that his object was to rid the world of "the three great buttresses of Christianity", "the idea of God", "freedom" and "immortality". It is impossible to do that save by the very procedure which he suggests, namely, bringing "the biologists of every country to agree that man is an evolved animal; that his lineage can be traced back into the geological past and to an animal pedigree".

There are men who hold to the evolutionary theory who are still "theists", so they say; but without exception they are not worshippers of the God of the Bible, nor do they in any sense accept the essential Deity of Jesus Christ; and evolutionary theologians need not be exempted from this remark.

Men, therefore, who believe in Science vs. science falsely so-called, and who hold to the authority and integrity of the Sacred Word of God, know full well that current infidelity corroborates neither science nor Scripture as to the origin of Man. The Book

of God clearly affirms his divine origin and the book of Nature knows no argument to the contrary!

2. **He is a direct creation, not a natural evolution.** The statement of Genesis reads, "So God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them". Three sentences, one following another in quick succession, to affirm once, twice and thrice the direct "creation" of Man—"in God's image", "in the image of God", "male and female".

This language is so clear that when men who still profess to believe the Bible, accept the evolutionary theory, they straightway start in to tell us we must interpret Genesis "allegorically", and not literally. No wonder! An allegory, indeed, if it does not mean what it says; but why don't men see that when they have once converted their sacred Book into a series of allegories, the Scriptures are gone. The word "sacred" is either a misnomer or merely a term to voice antiquity, and if there be any God at all, He has left the world without a revelation.

These same men will shortly be explaining Christ on the same basis. Prof. Shailer Mathews pleads for the completion of the evolutionary theory by letting it "include Jesus," while Dr. Fosdick, in order to save his evolutionary hypothesis from the collapse incident to believing in a Divine Christ, intimates that the claim of virgin birth was not even unique in the instance of Jesus, but common to the aura round about notable names of history

and even dares to suggest that a number of them were supposed to have enjoyed divine paternity and he names them! To all of this Dr. Bates, the aged and competent warrior of God, answers in amazement, and adds, "History tells us that the father of Buddha was Suddhodana; the father of Zoroaster is given as Pourushaspa; the father of Loatsze, while not named, is said to have been seventy years old when he was married, and the child was carried for eighty years in his mother's womb; Pythagorus was the son of Mnesarchus, a merchant; Plato was connected, we are told, on his father's side with Codrus one of the ancient kings of Athens, and Augustus Caesar was son of Octavius, a Roman senator" and so on, thus accounting for the human paternity of Fosdick's virgin-birth claimants.

No, sir; the Bible is not a mere myth-book of a piece with ancient stories of imaginary men and many gods. It presents the one and only explanation of the origin of Man that has commanded the attention of the centuries and compelled a well-nigh universal consent, and it makes him not the child of a brute nor the offspring of a god, but the creature and child of the one and only God, the God who made heaven and earth and all that in them is.

3. His spiritual nature is proof of his supernatural origin. The great scientists have seen and admitted this fact, men like Lord Kelvin, Newton, Agassiz, Dana, Dawson, Quenstedt! Sir Alfred Wallace, Darwin's superior, admits "There must have been three interpositions of Divine and super-

natural power to account for things as they are. There is a gulf between matter and nothing; one between life and the non-living, and a third between man and the lower creation, and science cannot bridge any of them".

In view of that admission on the part of one of the most noted of modern evolutionists, it is interesting to say the least to have some man, whose name has never been heard outside the few schools which have been inveigled into purchasing his output as a text book, tell us that "the human soul is accounted for by the development of animal emotions," and yet that is the teaching in one of the socialist text books of the day! And another one from the pen of Prof. F. S. Chapin, Ph. D. says "So in the individual and the social mind was born at last the idea of self, personality, as a conscious living soul or spirit dwelling in the body, but distinct and separable from it".

Prof. Conkling also, while yet retaining his position in Princeton, a school that owes its existence to that great body of believers known as Presbyterians, would have us think "mind and soul are natural and not supernatural". Such are the lengths to which school skepticism has pushed itself in the name of Science! The man who desires to believe that he is either not immortal, or, if there be any immortality in him, it is a result of advanced monkey emotions, is welcome to his philosophy, but the great independent thinkers of the ages have preferred the sane explanation of

Genesis, that "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul".

It is perfectly evident that Alfred Russell Wallace was unable to throw off this conviction after he had fully adopted the development theory, for he says, "The long course of human history leads us to the conclusion that this higher nature of man arose at some far distant epoch, and tho it has developed in various directions, does not seem yet to have elevated the whole race much above its earliest condition at the time when by the influx of some portion of the spirit of Deity, man became a living soul".

This is as far as a materialist can possibly go, and retain for his evolutionary philosophy any standing whatever, and it is a step in the direction of truth. How much more simple, how much more sublime, how much more in accord with the known facts of science, is the claim of Bible believers that "God created man in his own image" out of the dust of the earth a few thousand years since, and "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life", thereby imparting to him a nature infinitely higher than He gives to any of the animals, and giving an account of his mind and spirit that will forever remain sufficient to explain his mental and psychical emotions, his illimitable aspirations, his eternal expectations! When one has discovered the truth concerning the genesis of man, he is on the threshold of information concerning

THE RISE OF CIVILIZATION.

The university professor of the present day is expending no small amount of time in telling the students all about the gregarious habits, social instincts and even the "mob" spirit among animals, but as yet none of them has attempted to prove that the brute creation is developing a civilization. In spite of beaver cities and ant colonies, we may be permitted to apply the term "civilization" to the conduct of man alone, and in that connection I call your attention to three declarations and ask your audience in their discussion.

1. Civilization represents a gift, not a growth.

2. Civilization as often experiences decline as development.

3. Civilization is most often the pure product of religion.

1. Civilization represents a gift, not a growth.

Prof. A. H. Sayce of Oxford University, easily the foremost archeologist of the century, says, "Neither in Egypt nor in Babylonia has any beginning of civilization been found. As far back as archeology can take us, man is already civilized, building cities and temples, carving hard stone into artistic form, and even employing a system of picture writing; and of Egypt it may be said, the older the country the more perfect it is found to be. The fact is a very remarkable one, in view of modern theories of development, and of the evolution of civilization out of barbarism. What ever may be the reason,

such theories are not borne out by the discoveries of archeology. Instead of the progress we should expect, we find retrogression and decay; where we look for the rude beginnings of art, we find an advanced society and artistic perfection. Is it possible that the Biblical view is right after all, and that civilized man has been civilized from the outset? If so, we can no longer go to the savage to learn how our first ancestors lived and thought, for the savage will represent either degeneracy from a higher type or else a different race. In any case, the culture and civilization of Egypt and Babylonia appear to spring into existence fully developed, as Greek mythology averred that Athene had sprung from the head of Zeus. Archeology, at all events, has failed to discover the elements out of which, according to the doctrine of evolution, they ought to have grown".

The neo-scientists are now telling us that civilization is not only a development, but are attempting to trace both its evolution and direction. One State University text book on "Social Evolution" thinks that instead of moving from East westward, civilization moved from South, northward, and is to be accounted for by "climatic conditions". The highest form of people, he thinks, "are found in that section where the summers shall have a sufficient degree of warmth and rainfall to make agriculture easy and profitable, but not enough to be enervating; that the winters shall be cool enough to be bracing but not deadening, and that the relation of summer to winter shall be such that with

forethought every man can support his family and himself in comfort, the whole year round, while without forethought he and his shall suffer seriously." I have always suspected that the Minnesota belt was the only section of the world worth living in; and now I know it on scientific grounds, for those are the exact conditions of the University of Minnesota location! Does this account for the use of Chapin's text book, and will Mr. Chapin or the university professor tell us how it happens that the same sort of civilization reaches from the Rio Grande clear to the mouth of the Red, from a tropical climate to an arctic one, and that there are no essential differences either in the character or extent of that civilization as it affects the white race in this entire stretch? The argument of this text book is another illustration made by one of our educators recently that an educated man can make any philosophy appear plausible. Plausibility is one thing, proof is another. The testimony of history on this matter not only shows that civilization was a gift that came with the creation of Adam, but it also reveals another thing, viz.,

2. Civilization as often experiences decline as development. The older civilizations of Southern Europe, Asia and Africa illustrated devolution, not evolution. They did not perish from the earth, for they exist still, but in degraded form. Africa once knew a far greater civilization than it now knows. The civilization of Rome was leagues ahead of Italy's present estate. The civilization of Spain, greater, centuries since than now; while the

civilization of Greece confessedly reached a height to which few or no nations of the earth have ever attained. In the words of Byron, "'Tis Greece, but living Greece, no more".

To be sure, evolutionists will say that this in no wise affects their theory, since they do not contend that the exact same people shall continue to develop, but that the race itself is in a process of evolution, a position they are elaborately attempting to demonstrate and consequently make scientific. But who will answer Dr. James G. Walsh, professor of Psychology in Cathedral College, New York, who says, "Man has not progressed. The unhappiest age of the world is right now. There has not been a new thing in architecture in 400 years; the greatest novel ever written is over 300 years old, Cervantes' "Don Quixote"; the greatest play ever written was Aeschylus "Prometheus". Homer, the wandering Greek poet, wrote the greatest epic poem centuries before Christ".

This writer even goes so far as to say that "the Maya Indians of Yucatan had the finest civilization America has known, in sculpture, art and humanity".

To be sure this takes no account of modern inventions as an influence on civilization and a product of civilization; makes no reckoning of chemical and electrical discoveries, mechanical contrivances, and multiplied inventions that characterize our day, and increase our pride.

But it remains to be proven whether these inventions will lend progress to civilization or retard the same. It must be admitted that many of them will

eventuate in both mental and physical indolence, and some of the professors are even now telling us that the automobile may result in our legs one day being diminished to "vestigial remains"; the radio may reduce our ears to Eustachian tubes; while the multiplied forms of modern machinery may impoverish our arms to foreleg kangaroo-proportions and powers.

The effect of all this upon minds and morals we leave to the conjectures of theorists that now throng professors chairs; but the cold facts we have to face, and they are disquieting in the last degree; and all the more so because they come from accepted authorities among the scientists themselves.

Sir Wm. Ramsey insists, in his big volume on "The Cities of St. Paul," that the peoples who now occupy these same cities and sections of Southern Europe and Asia are the degenerate descendants of the great sires who once dwelt there. Sir Alfred Wallace in his volume "Social Environment and Moral Progress", says, "The fact that the physical characteristics of the Australians are substantially those of the Caucasian in its lowest types, has led me to conclude that these interesting people may have been descended from much more civilized remote ancestors and are thus an example of degradation rather than survival".

Discussing mental acumen and accomplishment he also admits that "it is doubtful if there has been any progress made in intellect" and illustrates, "Euclid and Archimedes are probably the equals of any of our greatest mathematicians of the day".

Speaking of Egypt he says, "This country in its high natural civilization and its remarkable religious system, was itself the equal of any that has succeeded it", but the most damaging admission of all is made by the most ardent, if not the most absurd of present day evolutionists, namely, Prof. Conkling of Princeton: "In the two centuries between 500 and 300 B. C. the small and relatively barren country of Attica, with an area and total population about equal to that of the present State of Rhode Island, but with less than one-fifth as many free persons, produced at least 25 illustrious men. Among statesmen and commanders there were Miltiades, Themistocles, Aristides, Cimon, Pericles, Phocion; among poets, Aeschylus, Euripides, Sophocles, Aristophanes; among philosophers and men of science, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Demetrius, Theophrastus; among architects and artists Ictinus, Phidias, Praxiteles, Polygnotus; among historians, Thucydides, and Xenophon; among orators, Aeschines, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Lysias.

In this small country in the space of two centuries there appeared such a galaxy of illustrious men as has never been found on the whole earth in any two centuries since that time. Galton concludes that the average ability of the Athenian race of that period was, on the lowest estimate, as much greater than that of the English race of the present day as the latter is above that of the African negro".

3. Civilization is most often the pure product of religion. This is so essentially true that if you will show me the religious books of any nation on earth,

and let me read them carefully and understand them thoroly, I can tell you what is the state of civilization to be found with that folk. The Bible has been taken away from most of the people of Southern Europe by Catholic prelates. The result is poverty, ignorance and immorality. The entire Protestant people, wherever they appear upon the face of the earth, have kept the Bible an open Book, and in proportion as they have perused its pages and practised its precepts, they have presented increasingly a stage of civilization noble to such an extent that today the nations of the world are awake to this evident and beneficent influence. The Literary Digest of Feb. 10th states "One half the Bibles supplied by the American Bible Society in the last two years, have gone to China. In 1921 the Chinese took 2,362,730 volumes of the Bible". Japan is also a large purchaser of that sacred output, and in spite of the trend of modern skepticism, the partial attempt to sovietize every state institution in the world, and scoff the Holy Scriptures out of countenance, the demand for this volume for the present year has been 30,000,000. It has been published in 732 tongues and dialects, practically every langauge spoken on the face of the earth.

"The proof of the pudding is in the eating" and pagan and heathen nations of earth are rapidly awakening to the fact that Divine revelation is the basis of Christian civilization, and, coveting the latter, they know they must adopt the former.

This all leads me to the last point of this discussion, namely

THE HISTORY OF RELIGION.

I purposely employ the name of a university text book, by Menzies, a volume that has as much error to the square inch as could possibly be packed into print and pages. It proceeds from first to last upon the basis that religion, like everything else known to man, is an evolution; a basis unproven, unprovable.

True religion is a revelation, not an evolution!

The average student of the present day university, and even the high school, is led to believe that the idea of God is an evolution, and that worship is an evolution, and that revelation is an evolution—theories that have no fellowship whatever with the facts involved.

One of the greatest living Semitic scholars, an Oxford professor, said recently to a personal friend of mine, "The original faith of man was not fetishism, nor was it pantheism, nor even idolatry. The oldest word for God is "The Heavenly Father". That accords perfectly with the revelation of God made to Adam in the Garden of Eden, and with the contents of the first and second chapters of Genesis, that man did not begin his existence upon the earth with some simian speculations concerning the moon and stars and other forces of nature, to finally work out the idea first of many gods and later of one God". That lie, like the evolutionary theory which begat it, is utterly indefensible!

Prof. Leander S. Keyser, the brilliant instructor of Wittenberg College, says, "There is not one ex-

ample on record of a nation that has evolved by its own efforts from animism, thru polytheism, to monotheism". While Principal Fairbairn, one of the greatest students of this subject, declares, "Examples are wanted of peoples who have grown without foreign influence from heathenism to fetishism and from it thru intermediate stages into monotheism; and, until such examples be given, hypotheses claiming to be natural histories of religion, must be judged as hypotheses still".

On the contrary, monotheism is now limited and has always been, to people who have been benefited by Biblical teaching and to them alone. Prof. Orr, the great Scotch teacher, says, "It will be time enough to accept this theory when outside the line of Biblical development, a single nation can be pointed to, which has gone thru these stages and reached this goal".

How absolutely contrary is this teaching of the great specialists in "the history of religion" to the superficial and unscientific suggestion of Ellwood that "industry, art, government, morality and religion and all other phases of civilization are products of the social life of man".

The natural tendency of religion is to degradation vs. development. Man began with a perfect knowledge of God. Fallen man's disposition is "not to be subject to His law," nor even to admit His existence. The fruit of this degeneracy of nature is written alike in the degradation of individuals, nations and continents. Take the most recent testimony breaking forth from the long buried past on

this subject, and you have a positive proof of the process in devolution, rather than evolution. The ancient king, whose remains are now being exhumed from his Egyptian tomb, bore as his original name, Tut-Aukh-Aton, son of or worshipper of One God. Later he changed his name to Tut-Aukh-Amen, worshipper of many gods. He did not, therefore, develop into a higher faith, but degenerated into a lower one. The fact is that 2,000 years ago in Palestine, the Christian church triumphed to such an extent that its overflow ruled Rome and made her great; but today the religion of that section is a most degraded form of its primitive faith.

The truth is that 4,000 years ago the Israelites of the world had a better view of God, a keener sense of His government in all natural and human affairs, than they now know; and, in consequence, exhibited a higher character and far greater attainments than now distinguish a people who have again turned from the worship of the true God to the Golden Calf, and from prayers to politics.

Perhaps the purest form of the Christian faith that has ever been found upon the face of the earth existed twenty centuries since and found expression at the lips of its Founder and defense and elaboration by the pens of the apostles.

Finally, **the proof of Christianity is in its civilizing and saving power.** A single book, such as "A Clinic in Regeneration" reveals what Christianity can do for even debased individuals. A single church such as the one in which I minister, reveals

what Christianity can do for the community in which its principles are taught. A single nation, such as England or America, shows us what it may do for an entire people. The bright spots in Africa today are the places where civilization is making progress, and they are the spots where light breaks in the wake of Christian teaching. The same remark applies to India, China, Japan and the Isles.

There is not an ennobling influence known to humanity that is not the emphasized product of Christianity. There is not a desirable institution existing with any peoples that has not been fostered and favored by the Christian faith. There is not a philosophy that tends to the social, political and spiritual uplift of mankind, that may not be found better phrased in the Bible than unbelieving man have ever expressed the same. The Christian faith, with its one and true God and its wondrous and true Book, has brought to the world more light and has given to living men more than all the philosophies of unbelieving men combined, and the crime of the ages is not the murder of individuals now characterizing and cursing modern society, but it is the sinister, devilish, damnable doctrine, now lurking in the halls of every university in the land and of all civilized lands, and seeking by smooth speech and in the name of "Science, falsely so-called," to destroy the faith of men in God and in His Son, Jesus Christ, and in His revealed Will, the Scriptures! The moral outrage of the century is the mouthing over of the name

of Karl Marx, quoting from Bebel, Belfort Bax, Blatchford, H. G. Wells and Van Loon and their like, men whose teachings are in perfect accord with Engel's charge against religion that it was a lie, and Marx' emphatic declaration, "The idea of God must be destroyed", and Bax' declaration that "The Christian doctrine is more revolting to the high moral sense of today than the saturnalia of Proserpina could have been to the conscience of the early Christians". The University of Minnesota is eaten up with such teachings. Such books as Ross' "Social Psychology", Parmelee on "Criminology", Chapin on "Social Evolution" and Ellwood on "Modern Social Problems" are clearly intended to do two things: destroy the faith of the young men and women who study them, in a personal God, in the Bible as the revealed Will of God, and in Christ as the incarnate Son of God, and in Christianity as His supernatural revelation, and so sovietize our schools as to make them hotbeds of Bolshevism.

Let these text books remain, let these professors cloaked in the name of Science, continue their attacks upon the citadel of revealed religion, and the time will speedily be on when your schools will be maelstroms of immorality and political iniquity, and your state will be no more secure than is Russia where this social gospel has triumphed against God and His Word!

CHAPTER V

EVOLUTION OR SOVIETIZING THE STATE THROUGH ITS SCHOOLS

EVOLUTION OR SOVIETIZING THE STATE THROUGH ITS SCHOOLS

"The preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness". (1 Cor. 1:18-24.)

I AM to speak to you today on what I regard as the most important subject now before the world for consideration. I realize the apparent extravagance of thus describing any single subject, but you may be my judge as I unfold this theme—"Sovietizing the State through our Schools."

Nellermoe's Bill presented to the Minnesota House of Representatives in February, 1923, was a deliberate, even open attempt to sovietize the University of Minnesota, knowing full well the final social and political effect of poisoning this educational fountain; and it is not forgotten that that bill died on general orders by the narrow margin of a single vote, 62 to 61; and but for the intellectual ability and moral convictions of one man it might be the law of that commonwealth at this moment.

This, however, is but a straw in the wind, for while I am primarily interested in the State of Minnesota, I am also pleading the cause and presenting a subject that concerns every state in the Union; in fact, that involves every government of earth.

If any auditor cares to question my motive, in what I say on this special theme, let me remind him that I have no historical back-ground that should produce in me the least prejudice upon this subject. I am the son of a farmer whose fortune was not far removed from poverty. Manual labor

was the most important school of my life and hardship was, in youth, my daily instructor. The years have not removed me far enough from either to create in me either the spirit of the aristocrat or tempt to the sins of special privileges. By birth and breeding, I am a friend not alone of the manual laborer but more especially of the poor and oppressed.

And yet this unbreakable tie does not bind me to silence about the threat that now hangs over every nation of the earth; and in spite of all opinions to the contrary, endangers beyond description! I speak of

THE MENACE OF THE SOVIET.

It is well, I am sure, to pause in my discussion long enough to explain some terms that are oft upon our tongues, yet employed by many without understanding. The Soviet government is supposed to be a government by the people, but it is executed through most remote representatives. The Community elects its representative, the county chooses again from these community representatives; the State or Province from these county representatives, and the Government from these State or Province Representatives, so that something like five elections must occur before the leaders are reached, producing a system of government that makes practically impossible a recall or reversal of an endless order. The term Bolshevism means "A rule by the majority" but strange to say, it has absolutely lost its significance

as a word, because it now represents the rulership of the minority in Russia; and out of that country, in its practical and potential expression, and out of Germany in its theoretical and even its theological aspects, this threat of the nations, the menace of the soviet, is come.

The movement was conceived in class hatred. It cannot be justly said that this hatred had no occasion. On the contrary, czarism in Russia and the conscienceless oppression by the rich and privileged classes in other countries, clearly accounts for the rise and progress of the whole product known as "bolshevism." It is impossible to take lands of inexhaustible resources and set over them unjust rulers, enact oppressive laws, execute the will of the higher classes by a ruthless military system without producing the exact result that has ruined Russia, where in twenty Provinces, in 1911 and 1912, twenty million peasants were without bread and eight million of them were receiving government rations, without finally effecting a political state unendurable, and a rebellion indescribable, if not unthinkable.

Popular opinion is wont to lay Russia's present wretched condition to the rise of the "Red," and only thoughtful men clearly apprehend that the crimson flag is the fruit of foolhardiness on the part of the "Rich." When the working day in Russian factories was from twelve to fourteen hours, and the compensation not sufficient to sustain the

lives of the toilers and their families, they produced and often rendered a song:

"Damned be the lives of miners,
Just as prisoners in prison
Day and night the candle smoulders,
And we carry death on shoulders."

The axioms of Scripture are more stable than any assertions of science, and all history is replete with illustrations of the Biblical truth that "They that have sowed the wind * * shall reap the whirlwind." Solomon wrote "The rich rule over the poor and the borrower is servant to the lender." "But he that soweth iniquity shall reap vanity."

The fact remains however that any movement born of class hatred is, by its very nature, nondesirable, even dangerous. The attempt of ignorant masses to throw off the yoke of potentate and conscienceless oppressor is seldom or never accomplished without the accompanying danger of coming under the hand of a new potentate whose oppressions will far exceed that of the old. That is exactly what has taken place in Russian rule. Lenine, notwithstanding all his professions, of "the rule of the people," in an address to the All Russian Soviet Congress, said, "How can we secure a strict unity of will?" "By subjecting the will of thousands to the will of one? Today the revolution, in the interest of socialism, demands the absolute submission of the masses to the single will of those who direct the labor process."

That sentence shows how society comes again

to autocracy, but to an autocracy of an unbelievable, brutal type; to an autocracy of ignorance, and from the oppressive rule of the rich to the more oppressive rule of the politically ambitious, from the brutality of the man who has some conscience to the greater brutality of men who have neither conscience nor God.

This movement has been characterized by inhuman cruelties. Twenty-five years ago George Kennan stirred the civilized world by his eloquent portraiture of Czar oppression; while Tolstoi's books wrought an intellectual revolt against the same, reaching every continent and profoundly moving every civilized country. The deportation of political offenders to Siberia, the chain gang system, that reproduced in a thousand facts the experience of Tabert in Florida, brought the very name of Russia into contempt; and made her ruling classes the subjects of universal spite; and yet, bigoted and bloody as was that reign, it was tame beside the slaughterhouse of Sovietism. A friend of mine, a great Lutheran preacher, was telling me a few days since of how eleven of their Lutheran ministers had been martyred in Finland; how forty-one of them had been murdered in the Baltic Province; how one of these was tortured past description, his tongue torn out, his body mutilated and nailed to a tree, swords driven in under his arms, and an inscription tacked over his head, "Now, damn you; preach your gospel if you can!" And yet even such brutality and butchery fades when one finds that under this same rule the land

has been confiscated, banks, mills, factories taken over, public debt repudiated; murder legalized, arson, public and private pillage—unparalleled in history, advocated; industry paralyzed, commerce ruined, assassination reaching into the thousands, either by starvation, death or chaos and throughout the length and breadth of the land the fundamental principles of liberty and civilization abolished. One writer says "In sentiment, bolshevism is an appeal that Lazarus shall be fed at the rich man's table; but in practice it is a brutal savagery which, like a wild beast, tortures and kills to vent its bestiality." The New York Times says "The French Reign of Terror was a mild and moderate exercise of authority by a government leaning culpably to the side of mercy, when contrasted with what is going on in Russia." The same paper writes of Lenin, "When his brief hour ends, he will have the satisfaction of knowing that he did more harm to the human race than was ever done by one man in any such short time since history began to be recorded in the tombs along the Nile."

But enough of its brutalities! Let me remark, however, before I finish discussing the menace of the soviet, that

It is the sworn foe of the Christian faith. Bebel, whose writings have had as much to do with the origin and growth of that particular form of socialism which finds expression in the Soviet, as any other, says, "The idea of God must be destroyed. Atheism is the true route to liberty, equality and fraternity." Its known repudiation of the Holy

Scriptures, its organized endeavor to destroy religion from the minds of men, its adoption of social codes that are antipodes of the Decalog, these are facts that have been flarred in the face of the world. The Literary Digest recently remarked, "There seems to be no question, outside of Soviet circles that the vicar general of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia was butchered to make a bolshevic holiday," and the murder was not an affront to the Catholic faith only, but it was an expression of Soviet atheism and of the determination to drive every thought of religion from the minds of men, and supplant the spirit of worship by a scornful skepticism, and an acknowledgment of God by an atheism that derides His very existence. There isn't a single one of the civilities of the Christian civilization that this rule cares to retain. They have deliberately attempted to destroy the family, to governmentize all women, and compel every babe that is born to be a bastard.

This is the move that has

AMERICA AS ITS OBJECTIVE.

The Soviet ardently covets the world's controlling continent. However much of his philosophy he brought from the evolutionary hypothesis of Germany, he chose Russia as the stage on which to enact his Darwinian drama, "the survival of the fittest." Into his choice entered the consciousness that Russia was a great world continent, that its natural resources were not only untried, but largely unknown, and when pilfering time came, it

would prove itself a prize worthy the pirate's pains.

Having come into the possession of that country at a time when it was exhausted by war, and in a way that paralyzed its every industry, it was natural enough that Lenine, Trotsky, and all other ambitious leaders should lift their eyes to America, to fields already white to the harvest, to covet them.

There are those among us who do not believe that this propaganda is marking progress in our midst. Such men are either ignorant of modern movements, or wilfully indifferent to the evidences about us. Lenine himself, speaking in Moscow, said, "The power that has crushed Germany is also the power that will in the end crush England and the United States." And that power is planting its dynamite at many American points, and placing its largest charges at our educational centers, and calmly waiting the time when it can light the Darwin fuse and witness the demolition. Henry Campbell Black, in his notable address on "The Menace without our Gates," or "Bolshevism's assault upon American government," reminded us of how this movement has made its power felt in every part of the world; in Roumania, and all the Baltic Provinces; in Switzerland, where it created a high breed of intrigue; in Portugal, where recent outbreaks were the consequence; in Scandinavia, where kings found it difficult to cling to their thrones, in Finland, where it has fruited in the foulest way; in Denmark, where though less successful, it is both aggressive and confident, not to mention its ravages

in Germany, its rise in France, its recent successes in England, and finally, its increasing powers in America.

The I. W. W. has long represented this sentiment here and new organizations, under varied names, are now giving more concrete form to it. The State Socialist Convention in Illinois a while ago demanded that the American Government should recognize the Bolsheviki of Russia. The State Socialist Convention in Minnesota adopted resolutions endorsing the policies of the Bolsheviki in Russia, and the State Socialistic Convention in New York greeted with joy and confidence the Russian Soviet Republic. The Pennsylvania state Socialist Convention cabled to Lenine and his cabinet, "Your achievement is our inspiration." There are hundreds of papers being published in America today that have one objective, and one only, and that is Sovietism; and there are thousands of professors in the Universities of this country whose writings and teachings alike, are a deliberate attempt to put over this same soviet program in the states. Some of these were brought to the surface during the war and divorced from positions; more of them have surreptitiously retained those positions, and in the name of "evolution" are so carefully laying their socialistic explosives as to do what Bouck White said he learned from his Seminary, how to "blow the Government to bits."

In America these Soviet emissaries are a multitude. The majority of the leaders have had either their entire course, or their post-graduate work, in

German Universities. They have brought back from these infidel centers a materialistic philosophy that knows no other god than Nature. Pantheism is their only theism; and by that they do not mean a personal God, manifesting Himself in facts and forms, but an unconscious and blind force at work, not only in the world but in the universe, the general direction of which follows the law of Darwin's suggestion, and know neither Divine control nor Deity-existence. The Attorney General of New York affirms that the secret agents of Lenine are found in that State, and back of them is a fund of $500,000.00 to be used for propaganda purposes. The statement was made that these agents have been circularizing in shops and factories, and that many secret meetings were held, culminating in an open session of three days in the Lyceum building. The chief purpose of this convention was said to be to absorb into the bolshevik movement members of the Industrial Workers of the World, all anarchists and radical socialists. At the Department of Justice at Washington, it was admitted that a code index of more than two thousand red agitators existed in Chicago, Philadelphia and other large centers. There were over 500,000 followers of this revolutionary program found in New York alone; while they have dared, even under the eves of the Washington Capitol, to hold their open meeting and ardently affirm their plan to over throw the present democracy and bring in the Russian regime, leading Senator Thomas to declare, "Our Democracy is found in greater danger today from

the forces let loose in Russia, than it was when Germany took up arms against Great Britain and France," and Senator Weeks to insist that "The American people do not understand that the real purpose behind this propaganda is the overthrow of this Government, and that until they do understand, it cannot be stamped out."

The method of the Soviet is as surreptitious as his object is sinful. In Russia, having captured control, he fights in the open, and brazenly demands of the world's nations recognition. In all countries where a strong central government exists, his methods are secret, his approach surreptitious, his purpose red revolution. A witness called before the Senate committee testified "I have information given me in Petrograd that already the agents of Trotsky and Lenine have been sent to this country and that they have in operation a central bureau of propaganda." This propaganda is as insidious as false, and I am amazed that our people have not taken it seriously." When the war was over and our boys were returned to the States by the millions, many of them failed to find immediate occupation and these secret agents stealthily attempted in a thousand instances, to render them dissatisfied, critical and rebellious. The American Legion was the Rooseveltian answer to that secret sowing of discontent.

This all leads me to the main point of this discussion, the place where emphasis must be put if we are either to appreciate the meaning, or mark progress in our opposition to the same, namely.

THE SCHOOL IS ITS MEDIUM!

The Soviet recognizes the controlling power of education. When I was pastor in Chicago my intimate friend and co-laborer was Dr. Carl S. Martin. He rendered a good service to both history and literature by his "Life of Wendell Phillips," the man whose ministry has had much to do with the framing of American ideals, and whose indomitable courage cut away the foundations of a slavery system, and let that slimy institution crumble in one colossal heap. Phillips stands in the front rank of American orators. His lecture on "The Lost Art," his oration on "Daniel O'Connel," these are master-pieces, both; but the one speech that passed his lips, that lives and throbs because it struck a note so true as to be eternal, was, "The Scholar in a Republic." With a genius peculiarly his own, a literary style that lacked in nothing, Phillips swept the gamut of human interest, and stirred in the slumbering spirits of all talented lads a sure consciousness that education ended in control. Quite eloquently did he say, "There is something more valuable than wealth, more sacred than peace," as Humboldt says, "The finest fruit earth holds up to his Maker is a man." To ripen, lift, and educate a man is the first duty. Trade, law, learning, science, and religion are only the scaffolding wherewith to build a man. Despotism looks down into the poor man's cradle and knows it can crush resistance and curb ill-will. Democracy sees the ballot in that baby hand; and selfishness

bids her put integrity on one side of those baby footsteps and intelligence on the other, lest her own hearth be in peril."

If any man imagines that Sovietism has no intelligent representatives, he knows not whereof he thinks or speaks. Her outstanding leaders today are those professors, in our modern universities, who are naturally materialistic in their conception of the universe and who in their devotion to the Darwinian theory dare to dethrone God in the presence of his worshippers. Raymond Robins is an out-spoken socialist, and he is a thousand fold more acceptable in the average university circle than is the most eloquent of conservative Christian orators.

Prof. Nearing was born in America, bred in our schools, and became a leading university professor; yet "The Times" names Mr. Nearing a Bolshevist. You know perfectly well what men have led this movement in Germany, and how from the position of Professor Liebknecht and his confreres have accomplished not only an over-throw of the German Government, but influenced all Russian thought. I have purchased lately five books, four of them employed as text books in the State University of Minnesota and one in North High School, Minneapolis. (1) "Criminology", by Parmelee; (2) "Sociology and Modern Social Problems" by Ellwood; (3) "Social Psychology", by Ross; (4) "Social Evolution" by Chapin; (5) "American Social Problem," by Burch and Patterson. Every one of them denies the Christian faith,

feeling that the defense of Darwinism is not sufficient without so doing, and some of their sentences are the most sacrilegious and scornful that I have ever seen in print. Chapin says, "The brute mind was gradually converted into the human intelligence." (p. 108) "Morals are nothing but the conviction implanted by the social group in the minds of its members of the propriety of the manner of life imposed by it upon them." (p. 118) "So in the individual and in the social mind was born at last the idea of self, or personality, as a conscious life, soul or spirit, dwelling in the body, but distinct and separable from it." This quotation he follows with a discussion that shows he has no confidence whatever that the soul is immortal, and likens the Christian faith to the Indian's conception of dreams, the Algonquin's "shadow" or the Salu's "Ghost" (p. 265-266). Burch and Patterson, in their volume "American Social Problems," used in High School, makes morality and religion mere animal evolution, talks of the time when man was incapable of determining what was moral and immoral, thereby sweeping out the Decalogue and all the other claims of Divine law. (Let me say that the North High School has one professor who refuses to hold recitations on certain chapters in this book.) Charles A. Ellwood, professor of Sociology in the University of Missouri, whose book is also used as a text book in Minnesota University, teaches that Religion is not a revelation, but grew out of ancestral worship. (p. 117) And that "the family is being created by the very conditions of life itself," fail-

ing to recognize the Divine authority for the same —and that "nature has developed in man intelligence," p. 69, refusing to give God the glory.

But to mark progress in infidelity, one needs to read Ross on "Social Psychology." He holds the experience of conversion to scorn; he accounts for it on hypnotic grounds (p. 16); explains Divine healing on the ground of mental suggestion (p 27); also insists that this may explain the miraculous element claimed for the life of Christ; says that in "saintly visions and revelations one is influenced by auto suggestion" (p. 28). On the same ground he explains "the apostles and evangelists," and the expression of "prophecy," the creation of "powers and persons" (166-7). The gift of tongues is held to some scorn, inspiration to an equal amount, as is also the guidance of the Holy Spirit (p 167-8) and he thinks "the two main sources of all these phenomena are the subconscious and the social environment." (p 68) The great awakening in colonial days, the great revivals of 1800, 1830 and 1858 were only the result of "social suggestion." (p 70) The extensive prayer meetings of 1873 were "a mental contagion," (p 71) on a level with the Dutch mania for tulips that took place in 1643, the "Ho, for Texas" movement, the California gold fever, the negro exodus, the Klondyke rush, all of a piece—products of the "mob mind." He expresses his fear of going fishing with "a prayer meeting Christian" lest he take "a fit and turn the boat over." He holds the holy communion of the Christian to scorn and sees "in it an ancient rite," and, by a sacrilege unthink-

able, "where primitive man eats his god." "He says the archaic spirit of religion is attested in the settlement of disputed points by appeal to the Bible" (p 272). It is little wonder that in the debate between Harvard and Yale the defender of Sovietism proudly quotes from Prof. Ross in the following words, "The current notion of the second or bolshevist revolution is that it was the work of a handful of extremists who captivated the Russian masses with their idea. Under the pitiless pelting of facts, I have been driven to the conclusion that this is untrue, the robbed and oppressed masses moved toward the goal of their unfulfilled desires like a flow of molten lava that no human force could calm or turn aside."

Prof. Ross reduces the teachings of the Bible to a level with "wizardry," speaks of a "chosen people," evidently meaning Israel, as "a legend" of "an ethics basing its norm on human nature and the nature of the social organization" and as "superseding the alleged commands of Deity"—(mark the adjective, "alleged commands of Deity"—) the precepts of ancient sages, the customs of the fathers, and edicts of Mrs. Grundy." In other words, Mrs. Grundy and God's commands are on a common level with Prof. Ross (293). On page 298 he reduces the Divine right of kings, **the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures,** and the Ptolemaic system to a level of the same absurdity. On page 305 he says, "Put together all the effects of all the atheists who have ever lived and they have not done so much harm to Christianity and the world as has been

done by the narrow-minded conscientious men who persecuted Roger Bacon." On page 336 he says, "The piling up of innumerable points about the text of the Pentateuch impeaches eventually their Mosaic authorship."

But I bring you the climax when I quote from Parmelee on "Criminology." To him "Spirits" are "hypothetical beings" only (p 16), "alleged beings" (p 17). He says of Jesus Christ cursing the fruitless fig tree, "This is like the child or savage who trips over a stone and then strikes it in anger because it hurt him." He says of the Christian religion, "It was derived from Judaism; the magical notion of the uncleanness of sex has been combined with and has re-enforced the ascetic ideal of propitiating the Deity by expiation and purification through chastity" (p 23). He believes that certain serious mistakes have been made in the introduction and execution of penal laws, "due to the mistaken conception of Christians that sin is transgression of the Divine law" (p 33). He doubts "if irreligion is a potent force for crime," (p 107). He speaks of the Hebrew Yahweh, our God, as a "stern and vengeful God." He writes, "The Christian doctrine of the forgiveness of sins possesses this evil influence because it disseminates the grossly erroneous notion that repentance absolves a person's responsibility for the immorality of his past conduct. It would be difficult to find a more antisocial and immoral religious doctrine" (p 109). He declares "The dogma of the forgiveness of sin still gives currency to the effect of an act that it can be

wiped out by repentance and remorse alone, or by the absolution which follows penitential acts, despite the fact that the biological and psychological sciences have taught us that the effects of any act, whether sinful or otherwise, upon the organism and personality are indelible," (p 114). He affirms "Religion and Science are irreconcilable," (p 113). He declares that "nothing in human culture is more archaic than religion, because it professes to teach absolute truth, and to inculcate immutable rules of conduct—consequently religion has always been a powerful force for repressive legislation, and therefore a prolific cause of evolutive criminality" He raves against the circumstance that the Christian religion has been officially recognized in America as the National religion, (p 471 f). He declares that it is a piece of affrontery and a violation of the constitution when the courts declare this to be a "Christian nation," of constitutional rights or religious freedom which it is their special duty to uphold. To quote his exact language he says, "Disrespectful mention of God, Jesus, and other alleged supernatural beings is prohibited in various parts of this country, in spite of the fact that these beings are reputed to be strong enough to defend and avenge themselves. In this fashion is violated the fundamental and inalienable human right of free speech, and the courts are furnished the power to interfere, if they so desire, with the spread of liberal ideas and the refutation of archaic beliefs," (p 476).

Feb. 15th, 1923 Edition of the Manufacturers

Record says sanely enough: "We cannot maintain government and discipline in human affairs by statutes or by police power. What keeps mankind in order is the conviction of a hereafter and a belief in the principles of right and wrong taught at the mother's knee. Once a great body of the citizenship acts on the assumption that there is neither divine purpose in the universe nor divine laws that must be followed, life resolves itself into a mere brutal struggle for existence. Evolution has well nigh wrecked every land that has adopted it.

"Civilization can stand, in a measure, economic breakdowns and financial debacles, but when you break down and destroy man's temple of reverence, his regard for holy things, his belief in religion and his hope of eternity, you simply rend asunder the very foundation on which society rests."

If our children are to be taught, from four to eight consecutive years, such God-denying, Christ-repudiating, Bible-scorning theories as are in these text books, let us not forget that thereby the last plank will be laid for the platform on which the Soviet propaganda will eventually parade its atheistic, anarchistic, and inhuman philosophy before the world; and let us note well the circumstances that—

Its triumph in America is the overthrow of the State. If we are ready for that, then let us bow before the procedure with open eyes! If we are ready for that, let us approve these text books and insist that they be retained in the teaching curriculum of University, Normal, High Schools,

and even grades. If we are ready for that let us applaud the atheistic teacher who tells our children that "it is foolish to believe in God," "a mental dereliction to believe in the deity of Christ." Let us cite them to Van Loon with his villainous infidelity and parade H. G. Wells, as a great authority, and quote from him these words: "The Socialist no more regards the institution of marriage as a permanent thing than he regards a state of industrial competion as permanent," and assign his reason "Socialism repudiates private ownership of the head of the family as completely as it repudiates any sort of private ownership. Socialism in fact, is the state family; the old family of the private individual must banish before it, just as the old waterworks of private enterprise, or the old gas company."

When the family is gone, and God is dethroned and the moral codes of the Bible are held to be no more binding than a deliverance of East Indian Dervishes our own loved country will come into the present Russian experience; infidelity, mental and moral; rapine, plunder, robbery, these will be universal and as we look back to the days when our fathers lived and loved, wrought and rejoiced, because they believed God, we will have a comparison that will involve a contrast as deep and strange as the contrast between Hell and Heaven.

The Literary Digest of March 22, 1919, carried an article entitled "Bolshevism's Heaven on Earth." It reminded its readers of the fact that the Soviet Government commissioned futurist ar-

tists to paint sky blue the entire Theater Square in Moscow, and to suspend snow-white lanterns from the trees in imitation of clouds, a symbol of "the heaven on earth," employed to celebrate its advent to power. But once that advent was working, the same magazine declares that Russian fugitives laid before the Overton investigating committee, facts that made "life look like a nightmare in a lunatic asylum." Poverty, sickness, distress, starvation, churches converted into theatres, where harlots and profligates held nightly revel, homes into houses of death where a battalion of Chinese executed the will of the Soviet Government in the destruction of lives out of number; the invention of cruelties such as have not existed since the days of Nero, and yet this is what some men are preaching, and some professors are teaching. God forbid that we should be silent while America is thus being menaced and the immortal souls of all men are being thus imperiled.

CHAPTER VI.

SHALL WE LONGER TOLERATE THE TEACHING OF EVOLUTION?

"SHALL WE LONGER TOLERATE THE TEACHING OF EVOLUTION?"

Matt. 13:24-30.

FOR 2,000 years the New Testament, and for 2,500 years the Old Testament has held undisputed place in the judgment of candid and truth-seeking men. The 66 books that make them up wax not old. These messages, like the mercy of the Lord, are new every morning, and the parables of Jesus are as patent and potent today as when, 2,000 years since, He was speaking. If I had not long been familiar with the Parable of the Tares, I could easily be persuaded that a new Prophet had risen and was writing against the teachers of evolution.

My task in this chapter, therefore, is two-fold; first to correctly interpret this parable, and second, to show that the Darwin teaching should no longer be tolerated in either private or public schools.

To the text then! "Another parable put He forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field; But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? From whence then hath it tares? He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather

them up? But he said, Nay, lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest, and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn" *(Matt. 13:24-30)*.

A careful study of this 13th chapter of Matthew shows that the man of these parables is none other than the Man, Jesus Christ, and it is His kingdom they were employed to point! By the interpretation of one of them (the parable of the Sower) He gives a key to all, and throws special illumination upon this particular one of the Tares. In the light of what He said, its study suggests the good seed of truth, the evil tares of evolution and the true test of patience.

THE GOOD SEED OF TRUTH.

The Word of God is the truth. Pilate's question "What is truth?" has not, as some imagine, remained unanswered. The very Christ to whom he addressed it declared "Thy word is truth". Churchmen who hold a school professorship, and feel it incumbent upon them to advocate the evolutionary theory, constantly tell us that we "need not be alarmed for the Christian faith, since all truth is harmonious", a speech that is needlessly gratuitous and utterly wide of the mark. The presumption that intelligent conservatives imagine there may be a clash between truth and truth is absurd upon its face. To be sure, all truths are harmonious! But why speak of evolution as a truth? Is it easier to

beg a question than win it by debate? Our entire contention is that in its conception, development and application, evolution is utterly false; as false to science as to Scripture; and so Scripture and this unproven and unprovable hypothesis can never speak together. "What communion hath light with darkness?" Truth is the embodiment of intolerance! It cannot be forced into any fellowship with falsehood. God's Word is truth! Darwin's theory is a falsehood and between them there can be no fellowship!

The opening sentence of Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth", is the only intelligent answer to the question, "Whence came all things?" To that question, Evolution has no serious attempt at reply.

The declaration of Scripture that "To each seed it is given to bring forth after its kind", harmonizes with Mendel's law; and to that law of generation neither land nor sea has ever presented an exception, no matter to what depths the seas have been sounded or the lands have been digged!

The late Duke of Argyle said as to the appearance of species on the earth, "The new forms always appear suddenly from no known source and generally, if of a new type, exhibiting that type in great strength as to numbers and in great perfection as regards organization. There are some tracks of time regarding which our records are as complete as we could desire. In the Jurassic rocks we have a continuous and undisturbed series of long and tranquil deposits containing a complete

record of all the new forms which were introduced during these ages of oceanic life. These are all as definite and distinct from each other as existing species. There is no sign of mixture, or of confusion, or of infinitesimal or intermediate variations. These 'Medals of Creation' are all, each of them, struck by a **new die,** which never failed to impress itself on the plastic materials of this truly **creative** work."

Algæ, the earliest forms of vegetable life, have not changed a whit in the millions of years since they made their first appearance; and a kindred remark might be made concerning every vegetable species, even the varieties appearing from time to time quickly subsiding and tending to revert to type. So also in the lower forms of animal life such as the horse-shoe crab, the brachipod lingula and others.

Prof. Wheeler, of Harvard, together with Prof. Forel, perhaps the greatest authority on the life of ants, took 9,560 antique specimens, 93 species and 43 genera, the same being preserved in Baltic amber, and after the most careful study, declared that these ants have, in the history of time, undergone no structural modification. The same truth obtains in bees, wasps, termites, all of which confirms the Scripture "To each seed it is given to bring forth after its kind".

If one take the higher forms of life, the same Genesis law holds and holds without a break. For men to talk of harmony between a false hypothesis and the Bible is as if they were attempting the

fellowship between righteousness and unrighteousness, a concord between Christ and Belial, an agreement between the temple of God and idols. Haeckel, with clear discernment, termed Darwin's "Origin of Species" as "Anti-Genesis", and yet to the present moment each and every one of the millions of forms found on earth brought from sea or land, illustrates the Mosaic contention and gives the lie to the Darwin claim.

It was the consideration of this fact of science that led Prof. Everett of Harvard to say, "Evolution, or this story of transformation and activity is a dream"; that led the late Prof. Agassiz to remark as a paleontologist, "I am compelled to say that the theory is a scientific mistake, untrue in its facts, unscientific in its methods and mischievous in its tendency"; that compelled ex-President Leavitt of Lehigh University to affirm, "All the facts of the past cycles of the earth are against Darwinism"; that moved Sir Wm. Dawson to write, "The records of the rocks is decidedly against evolutionists"; that compelled Dr. Etheridge of the British Museum to admit, "In this great Museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transmutation of species. The talk of evolutionists is sheer nonsense, not supported by fact", that brought from the lips of Sir Charles Bell, professor of the University College of London, the statement, "Everything declares species to have their origin in a distinct creation, not in a gradual variation from some original type"; that forced from the lips of Haeckel the lament, "Most modern investiga-

tors of science have come to the conclusion that the doctrine of evolution, and particularly Darwinism, is an error and cannot be maintained; and brought Prof. Wm. Bateson, the world's most famous biologist, to give the grudging testimony, "While forty years ago the Darwinian theory was accepted without question, today scientists have come to a point where they are unable to offer any explanation for the genesis of species. There is no evidence of any one species acquiring new faculties. * * * * Variations of many kinds, often considerable, we daily witness, but no origin of species".

Hence it is that Genesis stands approved by the world's most famous students, its enemies themselves often being the unwilling witnesses. No wonder the Psalmist said of this book, "Thy Word is true from the beginning".

On the authority of Christ Himself, in the parable of the Sower, **"The Word of God is the good seed."** The study of history confirms this statement of Scripture. Wherever the Word of God has been preached in the world, we have the proof of that declaration in the improved civilization that has been the product thereof. Constant tributes are paid to the Jew; he is the marvel of every generation and has been such for four thousand years. History fails to account for him, and is equally impotent to explain him. His intelligence, his victories, his continued supremacy in all the earth, circumstances considered, seem inexplicable! But not so! Only recall that to him the Word of God was given; that when nations were bowing down

to idols, he worshipped Jehovah; and when they were listening to the philosophies of men, he was giving audience to the inspired revelation, and we know why he has been the marvel of millenniums.

If one would press the principle further, let him call the names of the most outstanding and highly civilized nations of this day and ask what one thing has contributed to their uplift, and gives them power in the midst of their fellow men, and you know the unmistakable answer, "They have had the Bible, the Book divine."

"A glory gilds the sacred page,
Majestic like the sun;
It gives a light to every age,
It gives, but borrows none.

The Word that gave it still supplies
The gracious light and heat,
Its truths upon the nations rise,
They rise, but never set".

I want to speak respectfully of all my fellows, but I frankly confess that I find it difficult to restrain my scorn when some student-secretary, fresh from the evolution factory, breaks forth in that old hackneyed argument about the persecutions of Galileo, and the oppositions of Copernicus, and winds up with an eloquent plea that we should not go on forever holding views of the Book that put it into conflict with all science and discredit it accordingly. I doubt if such verdant youths know that Copernicus and Galileo were both ardent believers in the Bible; and both knew full well that their theories were not in conflict with it, but only with the false interpretations of men. One often

wonders if such aspiring scientists know the history of the other side of this subject; how again and again, theories of supposed scientists have come into conflict with the Scriptures to go down to a signal and eternal defeat, so that the morgue of scientific speculation is the largest and most gruesome to be found in the midst of men.

When once Science or philosophy has produced a book that excels the Bible, or propounded an explanation of the origin of all things that surpasses that of Genesis, or given us as many demonstrations of the evolution theory as the belly of the deep and the bowels of the earth have revealed concerning the law "to each seed it is given to bring forth after its kind", then and not until then, can we receive them and begin to pay attention to what they have asserted.

But to return to our text, I affirm without fear of contradiction—**For this age, at least, the theory of evolution is the evil seed.** It has evilly affected every ground into which it has been sown; it has made a semi-skeptic of every youth who has believed it; it has discredited every school that has adopted it; it has divided every local church into which it has worked its way; it has more largely paralyzed the powers of the church at large than any other error suggested or accepted in twenty centuries! It changed its leading exponent, Charles Darwin, from a Christian to an agnostic; it created in Spencer an utter skepticism concerning the Scriptures and sacred things; it made Huxley to question every fundamental of the Christian faith; it

provided a philosophy to Haeckel's "Riddle of the Universe" in which God is ruled out. It is the philosophy of life entertained today by a majority of the leaders of Socialism and Anarchism, and no two phrases were ever coined that became such shibboleths of blood as "The struggle for existence," and "The survival of the fittest" proved in the combat of 1914–1918.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." If any philosophy was ever weighed in the balance and found wanting, to such an extent that intelligent men ought to turn with loathing from the same, it is the theory of evolution; and if there is a spot on earth where this theory has rendered any profit to an individual, to society, or to the State, let its advocates migrate to that spot and continue their teachings there!

Mark you, we are not talking of "development" —we are talking of "evolution." We are not talking of improvement," we are talking of "evolution." We are not talking of "mere varieties within species"—we are talking of "evolution," or the "development of one species from another." In other words, we are using terms as the dictionary defines them; we are not employing that subterfuge of modern sophists—the use of language to conceal rather than to convey thought. Let such hypocrisy of speech be the exclusive prerogative of Mary Baker Eddy, the monopoly of Conan Doyle and Sir Oliver Lodge. But let all well balanced men and women, who want their word to be regarded, go back to their dictionary and they will find a fresh

justification of Sir George Mivart's declaration, "Evolution is a puerile hypothesis", and a vindication of the words of Dr. Traas, the paleontologist, who would pass this philosophy down to posterity "as a new edition of the Memorial on Human Follies".

THE TARES OF EVOLUTION

To the text again. "While men slept His enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat and went his way".

How full of suggestion that sentence! It shows that this sowing was stealthily done; it shows that the field in which the sowing occurred belonged to another, and it also shows that the man who did the sowing was an enemy of the Lord of the estate. What a parallelism!

The tares of evolution have been surreptitiously sown. It was night, and under the cover of darkness this enemy came; not in the early evening when people were moving about, lest he be detected, but later, when men slept and no courage was required to put over the dastardly deed. How true to history! I well remember when first this hypothesis began to be hinted in our schools, and how, once in a while, there would be a suspicion that some man was teaching it, and how almost without exception he would deny the charge and say he was misunderstood—he was simply presenting it that the students might know about it and be intelligent when the subject came up! That individual multiplied himself and that method became well nigh universal; and when, five years

ago, the Christian Fundamentals Association began to fight this theory, it was soon discovered that, like cuckoos, they had laid their eggs in almost every college nest, and made sacred endowments to unwittingly hatch them, and unknowingly nurture their young, and sent them forth to propagate their kind! It begins to look as though, in origin and animus, it is another anarchistic, socialist propaganda.

In the great southland, supposed to be conservative, the exact same process after the exact same surreptitious manner, is now making prodigious progress. Less than three years ago, Dr. Gambrell of Texas, president of the Southern Convention, wrote me from Stockholm, Sweden, congratulating me upon the defense of the faith I was putting up in the northland and saying, "Thank God, we do not have this problem in the south. I do not know a single preacher or professor who stands for the Darwinian hypothesis". What deception had been practiced on that great man! At that very time, for full twenty years, at Wake Forest, N. C., the brilliant president had been an ardent advocate of this theory and converts to his faith had been carefully distributed into other schools to do their surreptitious work. Ten years before that time, in Waco University, one of these graduates was the Dean of the School, and an ardent advocate of the evolutionary hypothesis; and that he did his work well is evident in the circumstances that lately professors have been forced out of that institution

because of their advocacy of this false hypothesis, and others remain to advocate it.

Only recently a pastor in another Southern State attacking this philosophy, found that the university located near had been fairly well saturated with it, and professors rose in resentment against the pastor's denunciation and the school and church alike have been divided ever since. For years it has had its advocates in William Jewell College and finally fruited in a Professor, head of the Bible Department, who denied every fundamental and frankly refused to worship Christ. For full five years it has been well known that the theological seminaries of the north were for the most part captives to this conception; now it becomes increasingly evident that those of the south are endangered. The great Southern Methodist Church is torn over this subject, as taught in Vanderbilt and at the Southwestern, and the recent declarations by eminent men in our southern seminaries have rendered the entire Christian body of the southland restless in the last degree and ill content with the theological teachings that characterize the same. Surreptitious is the word—sown in the darkness while men slept. How suggestive!

Mark well, **The field selected for these tares belongs to another.** What a striking parallelism here! The great denominational schools of the country were, with few exceptions, founded and endowed by men who believed God and His Word, and who would turn in their graves today if they knew what was being taught by that portion of the col-

lege faculty which is devoted to the Darwinian theory. Old John Harvard was a believing man; Samuel Crozer was a believing man; the senior Colgate was a believing man; George Pillsbury was a believing man; Col. Slaughter was a believing man, and so with hundreds of others who might be named. The same truth would obtain if one would take the great teacher spirits who, adding their incomparable talents to devoted wealth, Strong, Osgood, Patton, Weston, Broadus, Carroll and their like built up the great schools of America.

Even Prof. Shailer Mathews admits that the evangelical faith was back of the creation of the Foreign Mission Societies, the founding of first class colleges, the establishment of the greater theological seminaries, the creation of the Y. M. C. A., etc.

It was this fact that led Dr. Carroll, president of Waco, and later the founder of Southwestern Theological Seminary, to speak in loud protest against this whole thieving procedure, and watch his faculty with anxious care lest some lying spirit should succeed to membership on the same.

Not content with this entering of the schools they have touched the Christian home itself with this evil teaching, and there have sown the tares in the precious field of another. Scarce a meeting of educators of America, but berates parents for not having done their duty to their children, and home life is held up as responsible for most if not all their intellectual and moral deficiencies, and yet how parents can exercise an influence that will

hold against false teaching in the formative years. who will tell us?

I met a girl on a train coming out of New York who had been two years a student in Columbia University. They had taken away her faith in the Bible and had brought her to accept Darwin as an apostle of truth and to discredit Moses as an uneducated ignoramus. She told me she had planned to keep this skepticism a secret from her father, a great old Presbyterian elder, by whose sacrifices she was sent to the school. It is a dastardly deed to sow tares in such a field!

"The Presbyterian" recently told the story of a young Jap, who came to America and was reached by a Christian layman and won to the Christian faith, but when he had been at the feet of Harry Emerson Fosdick for a time, he came back, professing to have discovered that Christ was only a man and not a God as he aforetime believed, and was returning to Japan to tell them that the Japanese religion and the Christian religion could be easily combined in a program of secular culture and social advance.

A Baptist preacher showed me, a few weeks since, a sinister and severe threat, written by a professor of one of the state institutions of Minnesota, against his daughter's opposition to evolution, hinting most ominously that if she expected to graduate she would have to "change her attitude".

The text further tells us that this sower is the enemy of the Lord. Certainly he will not admit it! Judas never admitted he was the enemy of Christ.

In fact he kissed Him, and called Him "Friend". He believed in the exact same Christ that many of these men have—a Christ who was a misguided and mistaken man. But you say, "He sold Him for thirty pieces of silver!" Exactly! He is bringing a bigger price now, but is none the less sold by the men who name Him and then deny His word, discredit His deity, declare against His miracles and scoff His shed blood.

For what is this enemy working? For man, for institutions, for the world? Its very advocates admit that again and again the theory has led young men and women to doubt, to skepticism, and often to infidelity, yea even to atheism. They know perfectly well that this teaching has rent in twain the great God-ordained and universally blest evangelical denominations; those who stood shoulder to shoulder in a fight against sin, it has separated into two camps that have now turned one upon the other and between the battle of words have little time left for the work of God.

They know full well that they have destroyed institution after institution; institutions that were great and strong and spiritual. Witness Andover; it was the first of American Theological Seminaries in which this doctrine was taught—it went down, and God wiped it from the earth. Time was when Rochester was far greater than now, and Crozer. They are both going down. Union Theological Seminary has enough money to live on, but thruout the length and breadth of the land it is "a hissing and a byword", and now that men in the great

denominational colleges and Seminaries of the south are in the open on this matter, I predict an arrested progress, if this theory retains friends on their faculties; and in proportion as Darwin advocates increase, those great schools will decrease.

"An enemy hath done this". What then is the conclusion of the whole matter?

THE TEST OF PATIENCE.

To the text again. "So the servants of the householder came to him and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? From whence then hath it tares? He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, Nay, lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest; and in the time of harvest, I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares: and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn" *(Matt. 13:27-30)*.

Every true servant would like to uproot the tares. The fact that he so feels is the proof of his loyalty to his Lord. I confess to you very frankly, if it were in my power, I would take every false teacher out of every pulpit and professorship in the land, and I make the assertion without sense of wrong. When James and John saw the Samaritans reject Jesus, they wanted to command fire to come down from heaven and consume them as Elias did. Was it to their discredit? Of judgment, yes! Of spirit,

no! Judas Iscariot would never have so spoken; his religion was too intellectually cold for any such hot indignation to ever burn in his breast. Thomas, the Doubter, would hardly have felt so deeply.

But listen to the rebuke of Jesus, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them". That is the explanation of what follows in the text; "Nay, lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up the wheat with them".

The interest of the wheat must be considered. If once false teachers have taken root in the field of truth, it is hard to drive them forth without destroying the value of the field itself. It is on that account we have so few heresy trials. The falsest teacher that ever found place in pulpit or professorship cannot be tried and convicted without exciting sympathy of soft-souled but otherwise godly men, and he cannot be torn from his position without unsettling scores of fawning friends.

But let it be noted that there is nothing in the parable that opposes the stopping of the sower if he be caught in the act! When we have found one field infested and its fruitfulness ruined, it is a suggestion, at least, that we had better set a watch against the stealthy sower. That is the exact method of this hour. There are hundreds of teachers whose hands ought to be stayed from this broad-casting, and hundreds of text books that ought to be excluded before their teachings take root in the garden of the Lord, the Home, or in the greater fields, the Church and the World.

If men object to this on the ground that we are hindering the progress of truth, our answer is, "Prove the scientific accuracy of your philosophy and our protest ends". If they object to it on the ground that this is a country of free thought and free speech, let the parent and tax payer, whose most vital interests—children—are being injured, remind such sowers that where our fence is built and our fields begin, infidel liberties end!

Finally, the text assures us that **the season of harvest will separate the tares from the wheat,** preserve the latter, burn the former! Here again Modernism revolts. The very word "burn" is an offense to it. It will not have a God who will "burn" anything and yet what else can you do with tares? They must either be burned out of the world, or the world will be ruined by them. Fire is God's figure of cleansing and is justly chosen. If thistles be burned, their seeds will not sprout again. If the dirty iron ore, or the rocks specked with silver, be put over the flame, or the quartz shot thru with gold be so subjected to fire, the dross will be separated from the precious metal and can be flung away. What else can you do with dross?

Shall we leave the tares and wheat to grow together, then? Yes, until the time of the end, but it is not incumbent upon any man to go on cultivating a farm captured by tares. If infidelity is the output of denominational schools, we need not endow or support them. Wisdom would suggest that

if we are not to take them out and destroy them, we need not cultivate them. That is why Martin Luther left the papacy. That is why Charles Spurgeon quit the Baptist Social Union of England.

That may yet prove the necessity of a denominational division, an utterly new alliance, and give occasion for a fresh application of Paul's appeal to the Corinthians "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers, for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For ye are the temple of the living God, as God saith, I will dwell in them and walk in them, and I will be their God and they shall be My people. Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you and ye shall be My sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty" *(2 Cor. 6:14-18)*.

CHAPTER VII

THE CONFLICT OF CHRISTIANITY WITH ITS COUNTERFEIT

THE CONFLICT OF CHRISTIANITY WITH ITS COUNTERFEIT

CHRISTIANITY has lived in conflict, and by conquest! Like its Founder, its very life was sought from the first! Judaism, the mother of Christianity, attempted the strangulation of the babe while yet it was in swaddling clothes. The Rulers of Roman heathenism, and the philosophers of Greek Gnosticism alike opposed its progress at every point. As a religious faith, it has had to fight its way from the hour when first it saw the light. This conflict is well expressed by Uhlhorn, as it was waged with "Heathenism," and admirably voiced by Andrews as it was carried on with "Anti-Christianity." In all of these battles Christianity has come out of its contest a victor.

It must be conceded, however, that warfare has changed in method. When, more than two millenniums ago ten thousand Greeks, under Miltiades, marched forth against ten times their number, to the battle of Marathon, they met the enemy in an open field, and the clear victory was a tribute to the intelligence and valor of the Grecian conquerors. It told the tale of mind and merit!

Modernism makes such fair fighting impossible. The enemy no longer exposes either his person or his program. By ingenious devices, he falsifies the whole field of fight! In trenches, digged under cover of darkness, he hides; by barrages of smoke and flame and gaseous fumes he accomplishes at once the cover of his own forces and the discomfit of

the enemy; and by every conceivable camouflage he seeks to deceive and disconcert, while, by taking possession of the territory of his opponent before intimating that war is on, he wages a conflict as unfair in method as it is foul in morals.

To say that the New Theologian has brought his method from Germany, as well as his message, is to state the matter both truthfully and tersely. Christianity has had a comparatively fair fight with heathenism, and in its contest with anti-Christianity the conflict has been waged in an open field; but the battle with Modernism is altogether after another manner. The enemy here is not in the open, and the conflict is correspondingly difficult. Never in history has Christianity itself been so menaced as by Modernism which is only another name for Darwinism.

THE USE OF CAMOUFLAGE IN THE CONFLICT.

The use of camouflage in this conflict is the seriousness of the whole situation. Of all enemies, the counterfeit is most difficult to discover and to dislodge. To fight it is to fight a semblance, not the substance.

The camouflage in criticism is increasingly apparent. Albert Ritschl is held by some to have been the father of New Theology. That may account for the fact that camouflage characterized it from the first, for Ritschl openly defended the clothing of new thoughts and new theories with the well known garments of orthodoxy. Like the

passing of a spy beyond the lines of the enemy, by equipping him with the password and clothing him in the uniform, so Ritschl sought to invade the field of Christianity with enemy ideas, clothed in friendly phrases; and he defended his conduct on the ground that such procedure gave greater promise of success. The result is that skeptical young men-candidates for ordination-cram conservative confessions and pass favorable examinations before fairly critical counsels; pastors of most liberal views deftly conceal the same while corresponding with committees who seek safe leadership, while certain professors in colleges and Theological Seminaries, in stating what they teach in their classes, have paved the way for popular approval by quoting from most acceptable orthodox authors, only to show in later words, that they put into the sentences thus employed, a meaning such as was never dreamed in their original delivery.

So far has this camouflage been carried that certain critics have sickened at seeing their co-laborers indulge the same, and have even dared to protest the procedure as nonethical if not non-moral! Certainly Professor Gerald Birney Smith of the University of Chicago would never be suspicioned of conservatism, and yet, that he retains some ethical ideals is made perfectly clear when he says: "If there be allowed a spirit of ingenious juggling by which the newer (Theological) Science is made to yield something resembling the older conclusions, the sense of honor is inevitably dulled." He also condemns "new meanings" "smuggled in under familiar la-

bels." He charges the men who attempt this with "timeserving." A Unitarian writer declares that a friend of his, who recited with his congregation every Sunday a creed in which he no longer believed, thereby "forfeited his self-respect." So far has this camouflage gone that another destructive critic expresses the wish that modern writers would furnish a glossary to attend their books explaining the meaning of the terms employed. Let us remark, in passing that such a glossary would doubtless comport favorably in intellectual and literary value with that provided by Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy.

Thus, it falls out that **the Critic concedes, and, in some instances, defends the camouflage.** It does not require a man of exacting moral ideals to realize that such a procedure involves most "elastic consciences." In fact, this is exactly what President McGiffert,—though a liberal—denominates them. Is it any wonder that the men who think themselves out of denominational fellowship and who go with their conclusions to the small hut of Unitarianism, look with a certain degree of disdain upon their **"Fellows of Unbelief"** who abide in the more comfortable and spacious apartments of orthodoxy? How else can my former neighbor, J. Herman Randall, feel toward the Unitarian Baptists, that still feed from the full table of that Trinitarian denomination? How else could Dr. Hugh Orr look upon those disloyal Methodists who still draw fat salaries and hold Bishoprics, while

they repudiate everything for which John Wesley, and historic Methodism, have stood.

Some years since the "Zion's Advocate" said with perfect justice "When men surrender their faith in the supernatural and in the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Church, and can no longer preach and teach them, why do they not, like honorable gentlemen, resign the responsibilities which they have accepted, and go out and establish a platform of their own? If they have the truth why do they not show their confidence in their teachings by organizing their own institutions instead of continuing to receive their support from those whose beliefs they have solemnly promised to espouse? I think that common honor and honesty would lead them to such a step."

Will they take it? No! The overwhelming majority of them have decided that since the fare within is good, and, as yet, even special honors are not denied them in that fellowship, they will remain to enjoy both. One seeks to justify this on the ground that the Liberal's departure might leave evangelical denominations to a leadership of "reactionaries" and thereby become "dangerous to intellectual and religious liberty."

What is the conclusion of the whole matter? Is it not necessarily this—that **the Critic's use of the camouflage covers conscienceless cowardice?** In the interest of gentility this statement were best not made by orthodox men. We can reach it, however, our enemies themselves being witnesses. James Martineau, the famous Unitarian, said: "I

am persuaded that honorable laymen, themselves of broad church sympathies, are more alive than is commonly supposed, to the essential immorality of the liberal clerical position."

An editor of a Chicago daily newspaper, commenting upon the positions taken by a Baptist Professor in a Theological Seminary, said, "Is there no place to assail Christianity but a divinity school? Is there no one to write infidel books except the professors of Christian theology? Is a theological seminary an appropriate place for a general massacre of Christian doctrine? Mr. Mangasarian delivers infidel lectures every Sunday in Orchestra Hall and no one is shocked, but when professional defenders of Christianity jump on it and assassinate it, the public—even the agnostic public, cannot but despise them. If the expression of these infidel sentiments by Christian teaching makes a marked and saddening impression on mature minds, how must it affect the young people in attendance at the University? These young people are not contaminated by the teachers of Spiritualism, Theosophy and Free Thought who abound in Chicago; but when the very men whom they regard as pillars of the faith bend under them like a broken reed, it is inevitable that they will leave the University confirmed infidels. Even so, we are not championing either Christianity or infidelity, but only condemning infidels masquerading as men of God and Christian teachers."

The amazing thing is that liberal ministers, generally, do not awaken to this outrage; and yet more

amazing is it, that instead of curtailing they are increasing this deception. A professor writes a book entitled "The New Orthodoxy" and from the first word to the last it contains not an orthodox sentence. Another writes a book on "The Second Advent" and in spite of his title, his covert intention was to prove the impossibility of such an event. A tract appears entitled "Baptist Fundamentals," the main body of which was devoted to the denial of the faith of the Baptist Fathers. Tacoma, Washington, announced a Bible Conference on "Christian Fundamentals" and lo, every speaker appearing on the program was the opponent both of the fundamentals themselves and of the International Movement that has made years of notable history under that same name. The intent of all this becomes increasingly clear.

The author of "The International Jew" speaking of the Hebrew's ability to break in where he was not wanted, and control what he had not created, says in both Germany and Russia "The social system had encrusted around the Jew, keeping him in a position, where, as the nations knew by experience, he would be less harmful. As nature encysts the harmful foreign element in the flesh, building a wall around it, so nations have found it expedient to do with the Jew. In modern times, however, the Jew has found a means of knocking down the walls and throwing the whole national house into confusion, and in the darkness and riot that follows, seize the places he has long coveted."

It is a perfect parallel of what has taken place

in Protestantism. Evangelical religion, by a series of clear, strong confessions of faith, had walled against the Unitarian infection, but by massing their forces and making continuous assault upon both the right and content of those Confessions, the Liberals have thrown the theological house into disorder, and under the cover of the consequent confusion, seized the coveted positions in schools of second grade, in colleges, theological seminaries, and Universities, and are now struggling with all the power at their united command to capture the pulpits of Protestantism, the offices of denominational organizations, and make the rout of Orthodoxy complete. This attempt explains the clash of arms on the battle field of theology, and the array of opposing armies!

THE CREEDS TO THIS CONFLICT ARE IRRECONCILABLE.

I have weighed well these words! I know the challenge they contain, but candid men also know their content of truth.

The creeds of the two parties are now plainly declared. A few years ago it was difficult to get any definition of "The New Faith." Men indulged themselves in such rhetorical deliverances that it was difficult to separate the sense from the sound; but the philosophical fogs are clearing a bit, and the new theories are assuming more definite shape, and in no feature does orthodoxy discern the face of a friend.

Modernism is a philosophy pure and simple!

Orthodoxy is an experience based upon a revelation! The exponents of the first are devotees of Descartes and Darwin. The disciples of the second are converts to Christ and students of Prophets and Apostles.

Modernists, as devotees of Descartes, believe in the divine immanence and are practically pantheists. Christians, as disciples of Christ, believe in the divine transcendance and are always theists.

Modernists as devotees of Charles Darwin, look upon the Bible as an evolution. Christians, as disciples of Jesus hold with Him that the Bible is an inspiration.

Modernists, enamored of the evolution theory seek to develop the natural good in man, and trust to education and environment for redemption. Christians accepting the speech of Jesus as **ex-cathedra**, hope for salvation only through the regeneration of the Holy Spirit and by the merit of the shed blood.

Modernists, clinging to the Descartes philosophy of divine immanence count themselves divine in nature and make the inner consciousness the court of last appeal. Christians, believing the Bible to be a divine revelation, reckon themselves human and sinful, and look to the Christ of the Scriptures as their one and only Lord and to the teachings of Christ, Prophet and Apostle as constituting the authoritative basis of both creed and conduct. The result is that Modernists oppose all dogmas, discard all fixed doctrines, and trust the philosophy of the day to fit the fact to fate, while Fundamen-

talists turn to a Book, the teachings of which they believe to be as stable as the North Star, and the light from which will never fail, "'till the day dawn and the shadows flee away."

To the Christian, Christ is the essence of Christianity and the Bible is the encasement of Christian philosophy. To the Modernist "Christianity has no essence, no real, absolute truth, either as concerns religion or morals." Herman Randall, once a Baptist Minister, now, in both theory and fellowship Unitarian speaks the Fosdick Shibboleth as follows—"My own conviction is that if all the creeds and dogmas and paraphernalia of the churches in Christendom today, could be set aside nothing would be lost," while the orthodox British theologian P. L. Forsyth, grieves the "losing of the creed that can alone produce an experience."

This all leads to a further remark—**The proclamations of the contending creeds prove them to be poles apart.** It is all well enough for a liberal, retaining position in the camp of conservation, to seek to allay suspicions by saying "There is as little danger of undermining religion by new definitions of theology as there is of blotting out the stars of Heaven by new astronomy." But the fact remains, as A. J. Gordon once suggested, the same people who fail to blot out the stars or sun from the heavens "may prick the eye with a pin" and thereby as effectually blind to light as though the sun ceased to shine. Whether that be the deliberate intent of the Modernists we will not now debate; but by comparison of their philosophies with

our Revelation, we can incontrovertably prove that they have less in common than have the shining mid-day and the starless midnight. To illustrate, take the great cardinal thoughts of theology!

What of the God of Modernists? Answer, "God is a symbol to designate the universe in its ideal achieving capacity." Or "God is the spirit animating nature, the universal force which takes the myriad forms, heat, light, gravitation, electricity and the like." Compare these definitions with the Fundamentalists' belief in "One God eternally existing in three persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Take the Christ of the Modernists, Who is He? Or rather, in the interest of correct speech, "What is He?" "No more divine than are we, or than nature is." "Of natural birth and so, not Deity!" Compare that if you please, with the evangelical belief that "Jesus Christ was begotten of the Holy Spirit and born of the virgin Mary, and is true God."

According to the Modernists the soul of man is just "a flowing form of divine activity." Compare that if you please, with the evangelical idea of the soul's distinctive independence and conscious responsibility.

According to Modernists "Sin is a fall upward" in the process of Darwinian development; or, as one put it "Sin is a search after God." Compare that if you like with the Evangelical teaching that "Sin is the transgression of the law"; or, as the

great Joseph Parker said, "Sin is a brutal blow in the face of God."

As to the atonement, the new teaching is that the atonement was "a negligible quantity in the work of salvation" and the Bible expression of it, as accomplished by the shedding of blood, is the subject of the skeptic's increasing scoff and scorn —such for instance as was recently and brutally voiced by a Professor of Crozer Seminary. Compare that if you like with the Evangelical faith that "God made Christ to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him," and "Being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from the wrath of God through Him."

Compare, did I say? Is there any point of common ground where comparison can be instituted as between these opposite poles of doctrine? None whatever! One might just as well try to reconcile the midnight with the midday, to effect a compromise between truth and falsehood, or to establish a desirable affiliation between Heaven and Hell. Modernists have not only attacked God, denying His transcendance, and Christ, denying His essential deity, and the soul, denying its independent responsibility, and the atonement, denying its sacrificial success! They have once and for all repudiated the Scriptures themselves, which have ever been to the Christian believer the only basis of Spiritual knowledge, and the last court of appeal in all matters of creed and conduct.

Even this is not the last step taken by Modernists in their assault upon Christianity. When Prof.

Roy Wood Sellars of the University of Michigan, says, "The very attitude of worship must be relinquished" he does not represent an extreme, repudiated by the professed Christian instructors of liberal sympathies, since it is practically one and the same thing whether men cease altogether from the worship of God or decide, as Prof. Gerald Birney Smith of the Chicago University Divinity School, says, "The worship of God, in a Democracy, will consist in reverence for those human values which democracy makes supreme"; while the late Professor Walter Rauschenbusch, and President McGiffert both theological teachers, Dr. Henry Fredrich Cope, once General Secretary of Religious Education Association (so-called), and Frank Crane, the big writer of little editorials, unite in a demand that God surrender His claims of autocracy if He is to retain "our respect." Is there aught that infidels of other days urged, not now adopted and even outdone by socalled Christian Liberals? What thinking man could belittle the infinity of space between Modernism and Orthodoxy, or fail to apprehend the fact that daily they are drawing farther apart.

Time holds no promise of even a patched up peace. Ten years ago Liberalism was timid and so far as it was expressed by professed Christians, its ideas were carefully couched and kept the semblance at least of Scriptural suggestion; but within five years boldness has developed into brazenry and "no bones are made" of voicing any unbelief; while taking issue with the Bible has become a

popular pastime of certain University and Theological seminary professors. Retaining their respective denominational labels as badges of honor, deftly creating "Boards of Control" known to be sympathetically liberal or spiritually indifferent, filling the School treasury by forced drives out of which the professor's salary grows increasingly fat, they now declare "an independence of all denominational opinion," and boldly assert they will "teach what they please" without let or hindrance from any quarter.

So long as Germany retained the opinion that she was right in the world war, so long as the resources she was filching from the occupied fields of others were sufficient for the sustenance of her army, so long as her aggressive warfare was winning additional ground and bringing added honors, no armistice was given the least consideration; and as for peace, she regarded that as desirable only when her conquests were universally complete. A kindred arrogance possesses the army of New theologians; and, strange to say, kindred conditions account for it. Incomprehensible as it is to Conservative men and believing Christians, these Rationalists regard themselves as right. Unjust as it may be to feed one's forces from the larders of the people fought, Modernists believe the end justifies the means, while the capture of the schools of the North, the partial victories in the schools of the South, and the prospect of taking over denominational organizations and an ever-increasing number of pulpits, gives to the infidelity

of Modernism an energy such as the skepticism of past centuries has seldom known.

To make peace with such fighters is practically impossible. The tide must first be turned, and turn it will if the present dispensation continues. Evangelical churches will tire of this infidel lordship. Evangelical peoples will sicken of the husks of rationalism and yearn again for the fruits of the Spirit. Even now they are beginning to realize their losses and to rebel against the ruthlessness of "the new religion." Christianity will not be easily crushed! The true church holds her Master's promise of power against the gates of Hell. Again and again she has been trodden down to rise in renewed and unexpected vigor. Again and again she has suffered apparent defeat only to return to the field with fresh fighting powers. Modernism may be the apostacy of Prophecy; but, if so, her victories will be short-lived, and the final conflict will not end in an armistice resting on fourteen points only partially thought through and prematurely signed, nor will the peace of the future be contingent upon the formation of an efficient "Federal Council." On the contrary, "The Lord of Hosts" will bare His arm. Unbelief will be beaten back to the pit from whence it emanated, and "truth crushed to earth, will rise again," and rise to rule as is Truth's eternal right. Meanwhile both parties in the contest of Christianity with Modern Criticism must recognize—to coin a word—

THE UNBRIDGABLE CHASM OF THE CONFLICT.

The evangelical denominations are in twain today. This fact is seen by all careful students, and conceded by the honest among them. The regnant forces now at work upon the problems of faith have no tendency whatever to heal the breach, but rather to constantly widen the same. To announce this is treason in the judgment of the Faith-Traducers.

By calling attention to this cleavage, we expect to be charged with having helped create it and our responsibility will be identical with that of the flying horseman who warned the dwellers in Conemaugh Valley of the broken dam, and coming flood. Let the men who cut the dykes and loosed the devastating floods of infidelity know that history will discern clearly between the creators of this iniquitous deluge and the observant announcers of the same. Noah announced, but did not produce the flood. The dam is broken: the breach is past repair! The deluge of infidelity rises! It is a fight now to see what salvage is possible to faithful men.

On the one side "The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America," the "Religious Education Society," "The Board of Control," and the increasing leadership of the schools, secular and denominational (at least in the North), tend to an enhanced liberalism in thought, to the supplanting of Christianity by rationalistic skepticism, while "The Christian Fundamentals Move-

ment," the multiplied Bible Conferences, the rapidly growing Bible Training Schools, the outstanding Pastors, and the remaining orthodox colleges and Theological Seminaries, together with the overwhelming majority of the laymen in the churches, make an ever increasing phalanx of fighting men who believe, beyond debate, that the Lord of Hosts is with them.

It was the clash of these contending forces that was heard in the Quadrennial Conference of Methodism in Des Moines a few years ago when the book report was brought in, in the twofold form of minority and majority opinion. In that clash the Conservatives won. It was the coming together of these contending forces that was heard in the annual assembly in the Christian Church two years since, and in the meeting of the Baptists at Buffalo, when both denominations appointed committees of investigation on the subject of school control and instruction; and again when the General Assembly of Presbyterians warned the First Church, N. Y. to return to the denominational standards of doctrine. It was the crash of these contending forces that resounded from shore to shore when the subject of "The Inter-Church" Movement was before the annual Conventions. And let not the Liberals forget that the greatest single endeavor ever attempted by them went down to signal if not disgraceful defeat, when the "Interchurch" came to signal, if not disgraceful disintegration.

This line of division is theological and not denominational. In the main it is not a question of

denominational control, but rather of evangelical or non-evangelical creed. That is why it affects them all alike! There are men in each of the denominations, devotees of Liberalism, who by word of mouth and printed page have sought to create the impression that a few disgruntled fellows of the denominations have stirred up dissension because all did not consent to ride with them on their "doctrinal hobby" or adopt their "peculiar methods of Bible interpretation." But it becomes increasingly evident that this attempted explanation is the cuttle fish act. It is an inking of the waters to hide their own infidelity. As well come out into the clear and admit the facts involved. Dr. Henry B. Smith well said "One thing is certain that infidel science will rout everything except thoroughgoing Christian orthodoxy. All the flabby theories will go overboard. The fight will be between a stiff through-going orthodoxy and a stiff thoroughgoing infidelity." Those words written in the Princeton Theological Review of 1913 were prophetic and are confirmed by the present lines of conflict. Such are the forces that face one another today. Between them compromise is impossible and a truce is undesirable!

To part in peace is the only proper and Christian procedure. But how, and who shall go, and what shall be taken and what shall be left? I know perfectly well the protest that will meet this proposition. The Liberals of the world favor continuing in fellowship with the Conservatives. Why should they not? That relationship holds their only hope

of continued life. Their position is that of the drunken man who clung tenaciously to the post, saying in the partial speech of our Revolutionary Fathers "United we stand, divided I fall!" When and where has Liberalism ever stood alone? What strength have the confessed Liberal churches of the world today? How easy to compute their numbers! How quickly can you call the names of their colleges! How many fingers are required to enumerate their Theological Seminaries! What surveyor's task is it to stake out their wee territory! They are like the parasites that grow on the tree; they can only live by drawing sustenance from the larger evangelical bodies. Apart from them they have ever been without power. Witness their recent surrender of their Japanese mission. But a principle never to be forgotten is this, that retaining them is decline if not death for the healthiest body in which they encyst themselves.

Let history teach us! Cerinthus found place in the first century church, and his followers multiplied. John, instead of calling a prayer meeting to see if his views of doctrine would not fellowship those of this early Unitarian, quit the bath house when this skeptic entered it, lest God in judgment strike the place, and wrote an epistle begging true brethren not to receive him or his into their houses. And yet the faith of Cerinthus was far nearer Christian teaching than is the infidelity of Modernists. The effect of the Gnostics upon the early church was sore enough. They followed the method of Modernists and captured the schools, but in

the course of time the churches repudiated them and enjoyed a consequent revival.

Let Presbyterians recall the Socinian result in England in the eighteenth century and save themselves its repetition in the twentieth. As the "Westminster Confession" then cleared the air, and called the denomination back to the Book, so they rose again in 1910 and 1916 and 1923 to reaffirm their faith and largely turn Unitarian infidelity from their fellowship.

Let not the Baptists forget the consequences of the Arian teaching in England, nor the wilting effect that reduced them from a prosperous people to a nonentity, never to be recovered until the "New Connection" purged itself of this leaven and came again into the favor of the Lord.

Let the Congregationalists be not unmindful of the time when the Unitarian parasite so ate into that New England Christian body as to carry away at one time and by the most infamous "legalized plunder" one hundred and twenty-five of their churches, and leave them but a single evangelical body in the city of old Boston. Dr. Jefferson, of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York, himself a Liberal, referring to these defections from the trinitarian faith, and the bitter fruits of them, says, "I can understand how a delusion can maintain its ground one generation, or a half dozen generations, but I cannot believe that a delusion would be mighty over the truth through sixty generations. The two conceptions (Trinitarian and Unitarian) have met again and again, and every time they

have met, the lower (Unitarian) conception has been routed and driven from the field. Nineteen of God's centuries have come out of eternity since Jesus died upon the cross, and all of them have put the crown on the head of the higher conception of Jesus and broken the sceptre of the lower conception." That, perhaps, is the very reason why Edward Everett Hale, in his old age, was compelled to say, "I do not see why so simple and democratic a religion as Unitarianism has not swept the country long ago." The success of falsehood is fitful; its final failure is as certain as the existence of God. Truly, as one said of Unitarianism, it is like the farm which John Randolph of Roanoke described as "sterile by nature and exhausted by cultivation."

There may be some churches in America that prefer Modernist pastors, Modernist associations, and Modernist State Conventions. Let them have them! There may be some schools in America founded by the money of Modernists maintained by funds from the same source, whose Boards of Control and Faculties and curricula are openly framed in the interests of Modernism–Rockefeller colleges. There may be some foreign stations so far gone over to rationalism that they prefer Unitarianism to Fundamentalism. Such schools and missions have a right to live and to be defended by the laws of the land in teaching their infidelity; but neither these churches nor those schools and missions have a right to continue as ecclesiastical parasites, feeding upon the rich blood of evangeli-

cal bodies and bearing their honored names, and if these bodies have in them the spirit of John, or the life of Jesus, they will say calmly but firmly, "no further fellowship!" "He that is not with me is against me. He that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad!"

Maintaining, as our inevitable right, the installation of such pastors only as stand for "the faith once for all delivered," the maintenance of such schools as hold the Bible to be a message from God, the adoption of such literature as exalts Christ as Lord, the commissioning of messengers at home and to foreign fields whose names will not be anathema because they bear a message which is "another gospel," we will go on glorifying Christ as very God, and giving His Gospel to the world as its one and only hope! However great our loss in numbers we will be stronger in spirit and for service, the day those who have quit our faith are refused our fellowship also!

NOTE: for a fuller discussion of this subject, read "The Menace of Modernism," by W. B. Riley, or "Modern Religious Liberalism," by John Horsch.

CHAPTER VIII

CORPORATE CONTROL
THE PERIL OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

CORPORATE CONTROL

The Peril of Christian Education

Address delivered by W. B. Riley, D. D., at the Third Annual Conference on Christian Fundamentals, Denver, Colorado, June 12th, 1921.

CHRISTIANITY has, for full twenty centuries, favored and fostered higher education. Wherever the Bible, its text book, has gone, schools of higher learning have sprung up in its wake, until the term "Christian Civilization" has come to mean mental, as well as moral, progress.

The standardization of schools sounds like another one of those twentieth century victories of which education could justly boast, and in which its natural mother, Christianity, might greatly rejoice. Consequently it will seem to some, rude speech, and to others even a cruel one, when I say that the standardization of schools, as it is now taking place in America, is the triumph of skepticism, and the menace of Christianity itself. A remark like this demands both explanation and confirmation.

The conservative members of our Christian churches know that something is wrong in our educational system and they increasingly understand its inhospitality to Christ and His Cause; but the overwhelming majority of them have not as yet dreamed the basal difficulty, nor heard a hint of the inimical movement and organization of which it is my purpose now to speak.

So quietly has this movement come, and so silently has this organization been effected, that thou-

sands of our religious leaders do not know of either, and it was only the incident of placing my son in a Chicago school, that brought me to realize the extent of this organization and discover its headquarters in the Chicago University.

It is to make the public familiar with that movement, and bring it, if possible, to a careful consideration of that organization, that I speak. I want to show you an "Academic Octopus," certain arms of which now reach from the Atlantic to the Pacific, while other of its tentacles are, at this very moment, laying deadly grip upon the Southern states, and prove to you that unless its power be broken, American Christianity will well-nigh perish under the pressure of the same, to be displaced by liberalism that will recognize "a force that makes for righteousness," or no God at all, according to the pleasure of the individual, Christ as a myth of past centuries or as a man of high moral, ethical ideals as the personal taste may dictate, the Bible as an evolution of Hebrew thought or as a well meant book written by composite contributors whose names were long since lost, as the intellectual highbrow decides to believe.

But to do this I must trace the history of this educational movement for a full quarter of a century, and more.

I. IT WAS A SKEPTIC'S SCHEME OF EDUCATION.

The father of American criticism conceived it.

What Loyola was to the Jesuit movement in

Romanism, Wm. R. Harper became to the movement of higher criticism as it affects the evangelical bodies of the United States. Employing his honored place as a Baptist, his office as the president of their most outstanding university, and his unquestioned intellectuality, he took the initial steps looking to an Education Association, and became himself the author of a scheme that bound high schools, colleges and universities in the Northwest to a standardized basis of monetary standing, professional degrees, and predetermined curricula.

Its face bore no hint to the public of other intent than academic elevation, but history is rapidly proving that the original Jesuit never saw the future of his movement with any such clearness as Dr. Harper apprehended the possibilities of his plan from the very beginning. He saw in it a medium of domination far deeper than that involved in academic education. He clearly appreciated the relation of learning to religion, and of higher education to the philosophy and life of Christianity. One is inclined to believe that he had studied very carefully the Jesuit system, and learned from it the relationship of colleges to creeds, and of schools to coming society.

Enamored, himself, of the new religious views of the Wellhausen School, and captivated by German concepts, he deliberately decided to set in motion educational machinery destined to make over the thinking of America and displace all Puritan concepts of God, the Bible, Christ and the Church, with the more modern and rationalistic ones of

what he deemed the mightiest peoples of the world from the mental and military standpoint. He took his postgraduate work in German universities; he found his intellectual ideals among German professors; and by the process of higher criticism, he, more than any living man, popularized Modernism in American education.

While copying Ignatius Loyola in the method of affecting society by the way of the school, he parted company once and forever with that Catholic prelate in motive. The original Jesuit deliberately planned to make schools the perennial source of papal orthodoxy, while Harper just as deliberately determined to use them as the mediums of Protestant Modernism, as the growth and power of his conception increasingly proves.

It is interesting that just at the opportune moment for Harper's movement the Religious Education Society (so-called) arose and from its beginning proved itself an exponent of modern liberalism. This charge against the Society is abundantly attested by the ecclesiastical ties of its apostles.

Dr. Minot Simons, a Unitarian minister of Cleveland, voiced a well-based opinion when he said as early as 1913, "I am deeply impressed with the fact that the Religious Education Association is one of the most liberalizing forces of the modern religious world," and from his personal and theological standpoint, he was quite justified in the remark, "This association deserves our support as Unitarians, because it is doing our work to an extent that we little realize."

From its birth, it was infected with infidelity.

In 1919 the annual meeting of this association was presided over by Dr. Samuel A. Elliot, President of the American Unitarian Association, and "The Eastern," a Unitarian church paper,—said of that meeting, "Can we do better than to give thorough and hearty co-operation to the 'Religious Education Association,' which welcomes us without reserve or discrimination, and which preaches our message of education in religion with such persuasiveness and power;" while Dr. Durant Drake, of Vassar College, the man whose skeptical books have excited more controversy and opposition in evangelical circles than almost any other modern writer, comments, "The Religious Education Association is the most important liberalizing agency of the day."

From the first, it has made no effort whatever to confine itself to Christian limits, but has stood willing to receive, as Henry F. Cope, the general secretary of the Association once said, "representatives of every great religious division."

In other words, from the first, so far as it has made a moral and spiritual demand, it has been in the interest of religion rather than Christianity, and of liberalism as against orthodoxy.

On the confession of some of its exponents, its objective has not been a conversion of men to Christ and their intellectual and moral upbuilding in the Christian faith, but rather "the socialization of its subjects." Its official organ, "Religious Education," defines the term after this manner—"Re-

ligious education is the science of human growth," a definition that wholly ignores the intent and content of Christianity.

In view of that fact, it is a most interesting incident to learn that the Committee on Education of the International Sunday School Association once published a statement advocating what they term invaluable agencies in American education, in which they say "the field of religious education has such an agency in the Religious Education Association. Such an association should be encouraged as essential to the development of a scientific program for a democratic people."

To a student of this movement, it becomes increasingly evident that its objective is "a human democracy" rather than a "Divine kingdom," and the medium of its accomplishment is "a scientific program" rather than a Scriptural appeal.

In the development of this movement the infidel infection is increasingly evident.

In membership no religious creed is required, or even recognized. As its secretary has said—"Its members represent almost every great religious division." "They are one" (not in a common faith in the true God, but,) as the secretary defines it, "in the common faith that life's ultimate product is spiritual and is to be realized (not by any knowledge of the book we call the Bible, or any experience of the grace of God, but) by those known and orderly processes of development which we call education."

By sleight of hand performance they have con-

verted the term "Christianity" into religion; quietly disposed of a personal God, supplying His place with an educational propaganda; and made "Science" versus "Scripture" to appear the worthy study, as well as to become the effective slogan. They have done this so deftly that many of the denominations do not know that "Religious Education" stands for Christianity with Christ left out, for a religion that recognizes no infallible revelation, and for a redemption that eventuates only in a human democracy.

The remarkable thing is that every bit of our so-called religious literature is affected by it, from the semi-secular Chautauquas of the world to the so-called "Christian Associations," denominational magazines, Sunday Schools—yea, even the evangelical pulpits themselves.

More than thirty years ago I spent well-nigh a solid month at Chautauqua, New York. I was in my youth; the beauty of the scenery bewitched me; the varied program swinging as it did from secular to sacred with the ease and grace of the clock pendulum, rested and refreshed me; and the utter loyalty of every speaker to God and His Word, made the days gracious and uplifting in the last degree.

Visit Chautauqua now and what a change! Of the 1920 session a Unitarian wrote, "The specific interests of religion have been in the hands of Dr. Cornelius Woelfkin, Dr. Alexander J. Grieve, President Lynn Harold Hough, Bishop W. F. McDowell, Dean Shailer Mathews, and Dr. F. F. Shannon. Unitarians coming out from the great

amphitheatre each Sunday morning were wont to exclaim with satisfaction." Thos. M. Roberts, a Unitarian, writes of the same session, 1920, "I was so pleased with the leavening process going on there that I should like our Unitarian people to continue to affiliate with other denominations in this very important educational work."

The same leaven that has wrought with the Chautauqua movements of the country, has quietly, but effectively, fermented in, and changed over the overwhelming majority of Young Men's and Women's Christian Associations and similar social service and extra-church organizations, and has even invaded the evangelical churches themselves, capturing largely their Sunday School literature, dominating in no small degree a majority of the denominational magazines of the north and is now effectively expressing itself in college and theological seminary text books, and social gospels arranged by a chain reference system, suited to make one increasingly acquainted with the whole field of social, skeptical and anti-evangelical literature.

But this educational **collossus** counts himself but freshly in his boots and fairly on his feet. The full race lies before him. And for the acceleration of his speed he has conceived and adopted the standardization scheme.

II. THE TERM "STANDARDIZATION" CAMOUFLAGES ITS TRUE SPIRIT.

There is a present potency in the employment of that term.

When the World War was on this word "standardization" came into its own. It was applied to ships, motors, guns, and an almost indefinite number of needful things; and where sensibly employed, resulted in great savings on the one side and increased efficiency on the other.

It was only natural, therefore, that the church should again learn from the world, and before the war was even over, the denominational bodies of evangelical character were giving audience to eloquent orators on the subject of "standardization." They wanted everything in the church, from top to bottom, standardized. They wanted standardized organization, standardized methods of money raising, a standardized ministry. Caught by the smooth, sensible sound of the word, I, myself, at one time joined with others in signing reports advocating the "standardized ministry."

It was quite inconceivable that education should escape, for is not education after all the basal thing, and why should we continue—forever permitting schools to drag along below standard,—to adopt sub-standard courses of study, to employ sub-standard instructors, to pay sub-standard salaries, to receive sub-standard students, etc?

It was an engaging argument. The leaders fell for the phrase, and the movement swept the land like wild-fire. It is doubtful if there is a single old and well-worn word that was so rejuvenated by the war and set in such conspicuity as this word "standardization."

The surface appeal sounded most sincere and sane.

If there is one thing that orthodox men want to do, it is to be sensible. Their very decision in favor of orthodoxy makes them profoundly anxious to be also progressive. Having accepted as fundamental a stable revelation, they are determined to reveal to the world aggressive action. On that very account this word caught them, and when they found their fellows pleading for its employment as applied in the educational realm, they readily assented.

Some of us, we must confess, felt a certain degree of concern over the attempt to make this a rule without exceptions. We realized that had such a rule been observed sixty years ago, Charles Spurgeon would have been denied a place in the Baptist ministry; had it been observed fifty years ago, Dwight L. Moody would have been refused recognition; had it been observed forty years ago, Campbell Morgan, denied ordination by the Methodists, would have been refused the same also by the Congregationalists. We could not forget that many of the greatest Western colleges, and practically every one of the Eastern universities, would have been strangled while yet in swaddling clothes had the standardization of education been conceived sooner; that the greatest educators the world has ever seen would have either been denied the privilege of teaching at all because their salaries were under standard, or told that their disposition to sacrifice self for the sake of education would reduce the schools served to "insti-

tutions of a second order." We knew full well that most of our denominational schools, had the present standardization scheme been earlier employed, would have been still-born, since the state institutions from the beginning had resources which the evangelical bodies could not originally afford.

But we also reminded ourselves of the fact that these days were past; that Charles Spurgeon, Dwight Moody, and Campbell Morgan's places in history were now fixed; that professors who were once willing to sacrifice personal considerations in the interest of poor students' progress were mostly dead; and that the denominational schools, by forced drives, were coming to be financial competitors of the State itself.

Why not, then, throw down the gauntlet to the world and say, "Go to now! We will equal any program you can present!" And why not?

In answer to that question, a third remark.

For the animating spirit of this movement one must needs look beneath the surface.

The search, however, will reveal the secret! That we have already stated. The aim from the first was to capture the schools, and through them determine and dominate alike the Church and State; and dominate both in the interest of liberalism.

THE REAL OBJECTIVE WAS THE CORPORATE CONTROL OF ALL EDUCATION.

It was a task so colossal that its thoughtful author realized perfectly the necessity of combin-

ing, in its interests, minds and means. Being himself an intellectual genius, it was easy for Wm. R. Harper to call to his fellowship outstanding educational leaders, and being a much admired friend in the Rockefeller family he saw in the resources of that modern Croesus, the second essential to the success of his enterprise; and it must forever remain a monument to his genius that he combined the educational leadership of America and the financial genius of all centuries for the movement!

The Harper menace was thereby made potent by the Rockefeller millions.

This remarkable combination accounts for the success of the movement to this moment.

Mr. Rockefeller, with his accustomed astuteness, felt out the proposition by the small investment of $1,000,000.00 on March 1, 1902. With this bait he saw the fish begin to rise from every denominational pool, and on October 1, 1905, he increased his wabbler by $10,000,000.00. This grant stirred every pond.

Later, realizing that if he made the bait sufficient he could capture and salt down the entire school of education on Feb. 5, 1907 he pushed the Rockefeller Fund to $43,000,000.00. Since that time he has had his hook in the gills of practically every religious college, great and small, in the Northland; and he has now commenced to play his bait in the educational waters of the South.

When one finally sees the objective in all this, he may be filled with loathing and disgust, but even that will never overcome his admiration for

the man who has come more nearly controlling the business world than any other financial genius, who is today the determining factor in all future education as it never seemed possible that any mortal man should become, and who, through the audacity of his son and junior, has but lately finished the unsuccessful attempt—"the Interchurch"—to incorporate and control Christianity itself.

From the first Mr. Rockefeller invoked the aid of United States Congress.

When it comes to a knowledge of law making machinery, or an understanding of effective enactments, the average senator is an amateur beside Mr. Rockefeller. Under no circumstances has he shown himself incapable of making the government the medium of his money, mental or moral enterprises. His first million was followed by an immediate act of the Congress of the United States, approved January 12, 1903, incorporating the board by which he had determined to capture and control education. The charter of that "General Education Board" gave it the most extensive and exhaustive powers. Hear what the charter says:

"The said corporation shall have power to build, improve, enlarge, or equip, or to aid others to build, improve, enlarge or equip, buildings for elementary or primary schools, industrial schools, technical schools, normal schools, training schools for teachers, or schools of any grade, or for higher institutions of learning, or, in connection therewith, libraries, workshops, gardens, kitchens, or other educational accessories; to establish, maintain, or en-

dow, or aid others to establish, maintain, or endow, elementary schools, or primary schools, industrial schools, technical schools for teachers, or schools of any grade, or higher institutions of learning; to employ or aid others to employ teachers and lecturers; to aid, co-operate with, or endow associations or other corporations engaged in educational work within the United States of America, or to donate to any such association or corporation any property or moneys which shall at any time be held by the said corporation hereby constituted; to collect educational statistics and information, and to publish and distribute documents and reports containing the same, and in general to do and perform all things necessary and convenient for the promotion of the object of the corporation."

Commencing upon that charter, Bishop Warren A. Candler, of the Methodist Church South, said,

"It will be noted that this Board is authorized to do almost every conceivable thing, which is in any wise related to education, from opening a kitchen to establishing a university, and its power to connect itself with the work of every sort of educational plant or enterprise conceivable will be especially observed. This power to project its influence over other corporations is at once the greatest and most dangerous power it has."

To show you now how the Religious Education Association, Mr. Rockefeller's Board of Education, and the standardization of colleges are one and the

same movement, let me remind you of the potency of the whole procedure.

The standardization of the colleges of the South is now sought. Let them consent to it, as we have already consented in the North, and see what will be the effect in the instance of a single college. A school, for example, that has a million-dollar endowment accepts the standardization scheme and agrees to receive from the "Foundation Fund" through the "General Board of Education" $50,000 more. The moment that amount goes from the Rockefeller Fund, entire control of that institution as to curriculum, faculty, and board, passes practically into the hands of fifteen men living in and about New York, chief of whom is John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and in all fundamental matters the entire institution must consult the judgment of this fifteen, which, when it is remembered that John D. Rockefeller, Jr., is the real representative of these millions, means the judgment of this one.

Liberal as he was, Dr. Lyman Abbott wrote in The Outlook deploring such "concentration of power" and declaring that with "this financial power in its control, the General Board would determine largely what institutions should grow, and in some measure, what institutions should stand still or decay."

He likened its power to those of "the government in France and Germany" and declared it would determine the character of American education and control the millions invested in our multiplied

institutions by the "ownership of only a fraction of the amounts."

When it is remembered that John D. Rockefeller, Jr., is, on his own confession, a theological liberal, with no sympathies whatever with evangelical tenets, it gives occasion to my last remark:

The Christian school of America is passing into the coils of the liberal constrictor.

It is little wonder that such a far seeing statesmen as Bishop Candler of Atlanta, was filled with apprehension for the future of his fair Southland, as he faced the effect of this educational system upon the faith of the Southern folk.

It is little wonder that the Bishop says "no self-respecting institution should consent for one moment to this submission," and argues that "self-respecting trustees should not be compelled from year to year to look to this coterie of fifteen men, asking leave of this little Board with reference to investments and everything else about the college with which the fifteen men might choose to meddle."

Certainly he is justified in his remark, "Such methods must pauperize every one connected with such a Board-fed and Board-controlled college, from the wisest member of the board of trustees to the most callow freshman."

I can imagine your mental operation! You are saying even now, "But, you must be mistaken in this whole proposition! Intelligent men would not put their necks in such a noose." My answer is—Gold has more often driven God from the hearts of men

than any other idolatry to which they were ever tempted. Its shining attractions have more often turned their heads to mental and moral mistakes than any other tempter. From the days of Aaron's calf until now the apostle's words have found repeated illustration; "The love of money is a root of all evil!"

Our university presidents have gone endowment-mad. The modern **"drive"** is well-named, and the people are faring in the hands of endowment promoters, like "dumb driven cattle." I know working women who are sacrificing to the point of personal suffering to pay pledges made in answer to educational calls, supposing that they are advancing the cause of Christian education, who, if they but knew the facts, would prefer death rather than make contributions to schools that are discrediting the sacred Scriptures, that are denying the very deity of Jesus Christ, and that are scoffing His blood atonement.

It is a well known fact, however, that the African boa-constrictor has power to cover his victim with the slime that tends to insensibility, and it must be literally conceded that this educational constrictor has in some way managed to both silence the cry and end the struggles of its school victims, and as its coils tighten, the certainty of its ability to convert them all into one body—its essential self, increasingly appears.

If it were American education only, the situation would not be so bad, but our foreign denomina-

tional schools are feeling the pull of these same coils and are rapidly being converted into the flesh and blood of Modernism through the Harper-Rockefeller movement.

I have said all of this in order to say one thing more, and that is—The hour for the declaration of independence on the part of all intellectual freedmen has struck! The time has come for all schools and churches that remain loyal to the faith that is in Jesus Christ and intend to remain exponents of His religion, to unite themselves and take the defensive, and give proof once again that unless Antichrist himself is at hand, we will not feed at the hand of Modernism, nor take our orders from its lips, nor receive upon our foreheads the "brand of the beast" of unbelief!

In fact, our first and foremost duty is to organize the independent, faithful and efficient schools and churches of America into an orthodox fellowship that will not recognize the claims of this octopus of unbelief, but provide instead an education equally competent, yet Biblically based and Christo-centric, thereby meeting the demands of literally millions of parents who are asking, "Where can we educate our children without having them returned to us confirmed skeptics?"

CHAPTER IX

THE PRESENT CRISIS IN THE PROFESSING CHURCH!

THE PRESENT CRISIS IN THE PROFESSING CHURCH!

THE future will look back to the World Conference on Christian Fundamentals, held in Philadelphia, May 25, to June 1, 1919, as an event of more historical moment than the nailing up, at Wittenberg, of Martin Luther's ninety-five theses. The hour had struck for the rise of a new Protestantism. Martin Luther raised his voice against corruption in Romish conduct, but shortly discovered that doctrine and deed were so related that he must correct the former in order to secure righteousness in the latter. When, a hundred years ago and more, a "devitalized deism" worked its way through the world's schools, and finally threatened the very life of the church, changing bishops and elders into unbelievers little better than atheists, God raised up his own men, and by the wisdom and eloquence of a Wesley, a Whitfield, and an Edwards, He rolled back that evil tide. But now the very denominations, blessed by that Reformation, are rapidly coming under the leadership of a new infidelity, known as "Modernism," the whole attitude of which is inimical both to the church and the Christ of God.

In far Western Canada, on the comb of the Rocky Mountain watershed, near Stephen, the Canadian Pacific Railroad passes over the crest of the mountain. Near the tracks, as one travels West, he reads these letters, "The Great Divide," in an arch, erected across a mountain stream. At

that very point the waters of that stream separate. They have struck a stone and the one stream instantly becomes two; one of them takes its way to the East; the other, with greater velocity, rushes toward the Pacific, and the waters that were one will never meet again. It is a parable of what is taking place in churchianity. The issue of the hour is **Christ!** It is a question far more fundamental than that of crustacean church forms; it is a question far more fundamental than formulated creeds; it is a question far more fundamental than ecclesiastical polity; it is a question far more fundamental than even the scientific certainty of the Old Testament or the certain veracity of the New! It is this question, **"Is Christ the Son of God or no?"** But that question involves every feature of the Christian faith, and for men to separate over the "Rock-Christ," is to part so widely that their after meeting becomes impossible. He is indeed a rock of offense, and the more study we give to the Christ of Moderns, the more profoundly are we impressed with the fact that "their rock is not as our rock," the Moderns themselves being the judges.

The skeptical sons of believing fathers are giving new meaning to the words of the Lord: "I am come to set a man at variance against his father." Faith is dearer than flesh, and the fellowships of the future will not so much follow the lines of denominationalism as they will express the division over Christ. The great Guizot once said, "As for me, I am a Christian; I know what my symbol is." Let them who refuse it "form a deistical church!"

The time has come for a kindred challenge. Modderns, believing that "fellowship in social service" should be disturbed by "no declaration of fundamentals," move to the accomplishment of a "Confederacy." Let them form it! That will leave the men who believe in "the faith once for all delivered" in a new fellowship as delightful as desirable. Christ once said, "He that is not with Me, is against me; and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad." If that be so, compromise is impossible!

The great questions over which we have divided in opinion must determine our future and final fellowship. As, for instance, Christ and the Question of Deity; Christ and the Question of Authority; Christ and the Question of Redemption.

I. CHRIST AND THE QUESTION OF DEITY.

This is not a new point of division! Two thousand years ago Jesus forced that conflict: "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?" The answers revealed in-harmony of opinion, and the same still prevails. Evangelicals believe He was the Child of Prophecy; Moderns deny it! Evangelicals believe He was the Incarnation of Deity; Moderns deny that! Evangelicals insist that He was the expiation of sin; Moderns scoff the notion, and call such teaching "the Gospel of the shambles." With whom does the truth lie?

Was He the Child of Prophecy?

Let a Modern answer. Reginald Campbell is a marked Modern among pastors, and his opinions

have been generally applauded by liberals on both sides of the sea. He writes: "No Old Testament passage whatever is directly or indirectly a prophecy of the virgin birth of Jesus," and he declares: "Furthermore, the noble fifty-third of Isaiah, for example, and all similar passages about the prophetic conception of the suffering of the servant of God have, literally understood, nothing whatever to do with Jesus."

A Liberal, recently putting forth another volume, employed the pages in the back of the book for advertising desirable literature, and quotes approvingly from the St. Paul Dispatch—(that oracle in theology)—this compliment to Dr. Campbell's volume: "A fine contribution to the better thought of our times, and written in the spirit of the Master." To a Conservative, such declarations are nothing short of open infidelity! We cannot doubt the significance of that Scripture which prophesied the place of Jesus' birth—"In Bethlehem of Judea." No more can we doubt the manner of His beginning—"Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son," nor is there any possible reason for denying the significance of His name—"Jesus," a pledge of His power and purpose to save. To make Isaiah's grand declaration, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of

David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever" refer to any other than the Man of Nazareth—the Messiah of the ages, is to make it meaningless, and convert it into prophetic camouflage. The very church that Reginald Campbell served in London became a world-famed center of Christian faith and fruits when sound interpretations of prophecy characterized its pulpit; and its decline in both, dated from the day when these long accepted and even demonstrated truths began to be denied. If it were the life of a local church only, involved in the question, "Was He the child of the prophecy or no?" our concern need not be so deep and so strong; but when, as is perfectly clear, the life of all churches is at stake, and Christianity itself is in the balance, then men who regard Christianity as the world's one and only worthy religion, must contend earnestly for "the faith once delivered," or forever accept the indictment of moral cowardice.

But this is not the final question; it must be followed by a further, and even more fundamental one—

Was He the Incarnation of Deity?

Moderns say "No!" He was "a man," a "marvelous man," a "matchless man," the "noblest man that ever walked among his fellows," but "only a man." So far from admitting His virgin birth, they make Him the product of evolution. One writer pleads that the church use the evolutionary

hypothesis, completing it "by the inclusion of Jesus," and he is regarded as even a conservative among Moderns. The most noted of late Seminary Presidents, does no injustice whatever to the average theological seminary professor, who boasts himself an "advanced thinker," when he says: "Ask him if he believes in the pre-existence, virgin birth, miracles, atonement, death, physical resurrection, omnipresence and omnipotence of Christ, and he denies your right to request of him any statement of his beliefs." Ah, but when he comes to write books, he universally volunteers that statement; and while his language is obscure, and the meaning often evasive, the one thing he does mean to do, is to deny that Christ was the incarnation of deity in "any such way as to separate him from the rest of mankind," and he has no hesitancy in affirming that "the virgin birth cannot be considered a cardinal doctrine in the Christian faith."

How can believers be at peace with such proclaimers of infidelity? If we dared to consent with them, we would charge Him with being the deceiver of the centuries, for He said, "I came forth from God"; with being the egotist of the ages, for He said, "I and my Father are one"; the greatest faker that ever created a false faith, for He dared, even in the presence of death, to say, "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live again." It is little wonder that men starting with such skeptical premises conclude with an open infidelity. Strauss so commenced, but when his unfaith was finished,

it left him condemning Christianity as an utter delusion, denouncing Christ as "a deceiver," denying the personality of God, and scoffing the immortality of the soul. We grow tired of having men purloin from God's art gallery that matchless picture of His own Son, framed in the history of the ages, while seeking to stealthily slip into its place a daub of their own, which they have dared to name "Jesus." Thieving visitors in the Louvre have sometimes robbed the public of inimitable paintings; but these vandals in religion strive to snatch from the world its one and only priceless treasure. Men, who truly think, know that the conception of Jesus without His corresponding history would have been as impossible to the minds of the disciples and apostles as would have been the creation of His person and character by their words; and men who truly think will easily admit that evolution could never account for Him, since moral and spiritual perfection cannot evolve from corrupt human nature. His account of Himself is the simplest and sanest expression. He came "from the Father!" He came from "above!" As John, in his epistle, says of Jesus Christ, "This is the true God and eternal life!"

But the end of the controversy is not yet.

Was He the Expiation for Sin?

This raises the question, "What is sin?" and "What is expiation?" One Modern theologian so defines sin as to give delight to the heart of Mary Baker Eddy, and special point to Talleyrand's remark: "Speech was given to man to disguise his

thoughts." The definition is this: "Evil is a negative, not a positive term. It denotes the absence rather than the presence of something. It is the perceived privation of good, a shadow, where the light ought to be. * * * The devil is a vacuum." Compare that if you please with the evangelical position—"the devil is our adversary;" "sin is the transgression of God's law." From the Modern's standpoint there is nothing to expiate; from the standpoint of the Conservative, there is something that must be expiated or the stained soul must meet that something in the final judgment. From the Conservative standpoint, He, Christ, is "the propitiation for our sins" and the method of atonement is that of shedding His own blood. At the institution of the Lord's Supper, He said, as He passed the cup: "This is my blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." According to the Modern, that phrase is little short of silly; and that method of sin-cleansing is "unscientific" if not senseless. One almost feels like a blasphemer to quote it, and yet in "A Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion," put forth by the Chicago University Divinity School, Dr. G. B. Smith, the editor says: "To insist dogmatically, as an **a priori principle**, that 'without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin' is both foolish and futile in an age which has abandoned the conception of bloody sacrifice."

It is little wonder that men who go such removes from revealed truth should finally reach the point where the whole significance of Christ's sacrificial

death becomes meaningless, and the Master's very name is easily omitted from all their declarations of faith. In fact, Robertson Nicoll states that Dr. Colenso, in 1866, published a hymn book that did not contain the name of Jesus or Christ, and when challenged upon the subject, the Bishop replied that the omission was "probably quite unintentional." When men reach the position where Christ takes no considerable place in their thought, and makes no demand upon their souls, it is a serious question whether they should be permitted longer to employ the term "Christian" in either characterizing their fellowship or their faith.

But again our Rock divides the stream of modern church life, and this time the point is—

II. CHRIST AND THE QUESTION OF AUTHORITY.

The majority of the evangelical denominations have repeatedly declared in favor of the full inspiration of the Bible and the divine authorship of the same; and while they have looked upon the Third Person of the Godhead—the Holy Spirit—as the author of Revelation, they have also regarded this Third Person as the Voice of the Second, since without Christ "was not anything made that was made," and since it is said of the Spirit, "He shall not speak of himself, he shall take of the things of Christ, and show them unto you."

Were the Scriptures, Then, From the Mind of the Spirit?

Not according to Moderns! A notable Amer-

ican pastor has made the most remarkable statement concerning the authorship of the Book that has ever found place in print. Rosseau, Voltaire, Paine and Ingersoll would, if they were yet alive, listen with admiration to his remark, and wonder at the daring of its infidelity. This pastor says of the Book, "It came up out of the human heart." That remark beautifully paves the way for his later declaration, "The Bible is not infallible in its words, for no translation is faultless. It is not infallible in its language, for though the style is good, it is not perfect. It is not infallible in its facts, for an historian occasionally slips. It is not infallible in its theories, for its theories of the physical universe are mistaken. It is not infallible in its arguments, for some of its arguments are weak. It is not infallible in its moral sanctions, for the Hebrews undoubtedly sometimes confounded their own impulses with the voice of God. It is not infallible in the expectations of even its greatest men, for all the apostles expected Jesus to return within their own lifetime." His declarations in this volume have been widely approved by Moderns.

How extensively this American has traveled in Germany we do not know, but certain it is that this view of the Bible would be a delight to Rudolph Schmid, who, under the title "The Scientific Creed of the Theologian," scouts alike the historical, the scientific, and even the moral accuracy of much to be found within what has been supposed to be the "Word of God." It all finally comes to the blatant statement of another pastor to whom we formerly

referred: "I question whether we should ever have heard of the Old Testament if it had not been for Jesus; and the New is only a statement of what some good men thought about Jesus and His Gospel at the beginning of Christian history."

It is easy to see the Great Divide at this point; and the idea of accomplishing a federation between men representing this infidelity and those contending for the orthodox position—"the Bible, the Word of God"—would indicate that Federationists have concluded that no such thing as conviction remains; and that "the faith of our fathers" is not only dead, but long since buried out of the sight of twentieth century scientists.

I had thought to raise a second question, namely this—

Were the Men Who Wrote the Bible Infallibly Inspired?

It hardly seems worth while. In discussing the first, "Were the Scriptures from the mind of the Spirit?" we have been forced to a consideration of the second; in fact, they are one and the same. If "holy men of old" did not speak "as they were borne along by the Holy Ghost," then the claim of "infallibility," or even of "inspiration," is baseless. But the Book is not so easily disposed of. Its standing in history, for two thousand to thirty-five hundred years, has to be reckoned with; its influence in the world cannot be forgotten because somebody has attempted its discrediting. The grandeur of its content must be accounted for; the

magnificence of its moral maxims must be explained; its ability to luminate the paths of the world's most intellectual, and even to bring brightness to dark continents—these things must be taken into account.

Facts are stubborn forces, and the influence of the Bible is one of the most potential facts of all history. Either it is an inspired volume, or it is the rock on which the whole theory of evolution—Modernism itself, makes shipwreck. The man Moses is not matched by the Modern; the Pentateuch outshines all twentieth century deliverances; the Proverbs still hold the wisdom and the wit of the ages; the Psalms still provide the inspiration of all soulful song. The indictments lodged against the Bible yesterday are all dead issues today; all claims of scientific inaccuracies remain without demonstration; and the greatest men who have studied this Book most stand absolutely ready to unite their voices in the chorus:

"Almighty Lord, the sun shall fail,
The moon forget her nightly tale,
The deepest silence hush on high,
The radiant chorus of the sky.

But, fixed for everlasting years,
Unmoved amid the wreck of spheres,
Thy Word shall shine in cloudless day,
When heaven and earth have passed away."

The sanest explanation that has ever been made of the deep, lasting, wholesome influence of this volume finds explanation in the sentence "All Scripture is God-breathed."

The truth is this: **that Christ Himself was nothing more than the Word incarnate.** John long since

voiced that thought "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Thirty years ago a thoughtful Chicago preacher, addressing his brethren in the ministry, said to them: "You are attacking the Old Testament now; ten years hence you will dare to attack the New, and before a quarter of a century has passed, you will undertake to discredit the Christ Himself." His prophecy has found an absolute fulfillment! And yet the fact is, when they spoke against the Old Testament they were discrediting the Christ; when they spoke against the New Testament they were discrediting the Christ —Christ is the Word! Of the Book, the Psalmist said: "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path." Of Christ, the Word, it is written, "there is a Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Horatius Bonar must have been dwelling upon that thought when he wrote:

"I heard the voice of Jesus say,
'I am this dark world's light;
Look unto me, thy morn shall rise,
And all thy day be bright.'
I looked to Jesus, and I found
In Him my Star, my Sun;
And in that Light of Life I'll Walk
Till traveling days are done."

And yet at another point this "Great Divide" is equally apparent, namely—

III. CHRIST AND THE QUESTION OF REDEMPTION.

Opposing schools are attempting to interpret Christ's mission to the world. Those who make the

plain teaching of the Bible the rule of all faith and practice look upon this age as the "Church period," a period in which the Holy Spirit is the Administrator of God's earth plans; and they recognize in a true church a "called out" company, who have found in Christ what Noah and his household found in the ark, the only place of safety from judgment.

They also see in the church God's appointed institution for this dispensation; and clearly read from the sacred Scriptures God's intention to follow it with another, namely, the righteous dispensation of "the kingdom."

To introduce this kingdom age Christ will return in person, build again "the throne of David," and sway the sceptre of sovereignty "from sea to sea, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth." For one thousand years He will be the world's one and only KING. Universal peace will be the world's portion; universal prosperity the lot of the people. That age will end in the final judgment, and usher in eternity.

On the contrary, Moderns, who still claim to be Christians, teach that the kingdom of God is now in existence, and has been from the beginning of the world. Its manifestation was made the more clear by the appearance of Jesus. The renewing process is to be a slow growth resulting from the preaching of the Gospel, which they would like to limit to the Sermon on the Mount, and which will finally practically Christianize the world. This age, when it waxes more moral, will be worthy the

name of "Millennium;" and at the termination of it there will be the judgment of all men, both bad and good, and the introduction of eternity.

Here, as in the previous point of discussion, the whole question turns on the method of treating Scripture. The school to which prophets and apostles, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the early church fathers (with the exception of Origen) all belonged, was confessedly premillennial. This is practically admitted by the Modern himself. He admits that "the ancient Hebrew prophets announced the advent of a terrible day of Jehovah when the old order of things would suddenly pass away. Later prophets foretold a day of restoration for the exiles when all nature would be miraculously changed and an ideal kingdom of David established. The seers of subsequent times portrayed the coming of a truly heavenly rule of God when the faithful would participate in millennial blessings. Early Christians expected soon to behold Christ returning upon the clouds even as they had seen him in their visions, literally ascending into heaven. * * *" "Any attempt to evade these literalistic features of biblical (teaching) imagery is futile." And this Modern finds himself unable to imagine "Mark's feelings had he been told, in certain modern fashion, that his prediction of Christ's return was to be fulfilled in the Lutheran Reformation, in the French Revolution, in the Wesleyan Revival, in the emancipation of the slaves, in the spread of foreign missions, in the democratization of Russia, or in the outcome of the late world-war?" He even goes so far as to say

"Premillennialists are thoroughly justified in their protest against those opponents who allegorize or spiritualize pertinent Biblical passages, thus retaining Scriptural phrases while utterly perverting their original significance."

It is time that we gave to the world Biblical definitions. It is time that we let the people who make up the churches know the answers to such pertinent questions as these, for instance: What was Christ's purpose in the church? Why Christ's promise of a kingdom? What is the necessity of Christ's personal return?

What was Christ's purpose in the Church?

There is no debate as to the meaning of the word "ecclesia." By common consent, it means a "called out" company. Manifestly that would be a strange word to employ if God expected His church to finally become co-extensive with the world itself. On the contrary, if it was appointed, and is being employed as a witness-bearing company, then again we have an argument for verbal inspiration, and the word chosen, "ecclesia," conveys an exact idea. Wherever the idea has obtained that the church was to become coextensive with the world, the very attempt to make it such has corrupted the church itself. It accounted for the conduct of Augustine and for the putridity of the Papacy. "Modernism" is at this very moment demoralizing the church of God by the same conception. It would take the unregenerate world into the church. Think of the President of a great denomination daring to

day, "My ideal church would be so big and broad, so true and tolerant, so virile and varied, so strong and secure in the hearts of the people, that no one would think of having more than one such institution to serve any given community or neighborhood, even though such district might embrace five or ten thousand souls. You would find within its fellowship Jew and Gentile, Protestant and Catholic, Trinitarian and Unitarian, ritualist and evangelist. Even the reverent agnostic would not be barred out of such a church if I were its doorkeeper, and I have seen some so-called atheists who wouldn't hurt such a spiritual fellowship."

The Federation movement that is seeking to capture denominational conventions now in session, is a direct product of this modern definition of "the church." Men who know their Book will not be caught by its fallacious arguments. The confederacies of the past have commonly resulted in a fresh crucifixion of the Christ and a final corruption of His church.

If any attention whatever is to be paid to that best of teachers—experience—instructed disciples would no more join this apparently successful but deceptive movement, than John would have united hands with the company of Judas who in one breath proclaimed Christ as "Master" and plotted His murder. That God's men are forever to remain broken into factions or denominations by comparatively unimportant differences, can hardly be the Divine mind; but for them to unite by the practical abolition of all "fundamentals of the faith" is theo-

logical bolshevism, and it is to accomplish an apparent success by laying the foundations for the most colossal failure that ever cursed the cause of righteousness. The very purpose of the church in the world at this moment is that of witnessing to the truth—to the truth of His virgin birth; to the truth of His miraculous power, to the truth of His atoning death, to the truth of His certain resurrection, to the truth of His present intercession, and to the truth of His final revelation as coming Lord and King.

That being clearly seen, it is not a far cry to the answer of our second question.

Why the promise of His coming Kingdom?

Of the church it is said, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Of the kingdom it is asserted, "It shall be over all the earth." "It shall be in righteousness." Its Ruler shall be "the Prince of Peace." Its prosperity shall exceed all Utopian dreams; its full and final establishment shall justify the Father's plans, the Son's sacrifice, and the Spirit's prophecies. "The mere passage of time" may have rendered large portions of the "biblical imagery untenable for Moderns," but it has not detracted one whit from the true believer's confidence in "the sure word of prophecy." He looks for a kingdom, and prays in the exact speech put into his lips by his Lord, "Thy kingdom come;" and tells the whole world the meaning of his prayer by a divine definition, "Thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven."

A writer makes what he thinks an unanswerable argument from the fact that of the two hundred and thirty-six members of the faculties of theological seminaries, representing twenty-seven leading institutions, and eight denominations, there are only eight premillennialists, and he concludes that that is positive proof either that the premillennial position is wrong, or that these professional scholars know less about the Bible teaching than other men. It may not have occurred to this professor to reflect upon the circumstance that of all the Bible teachers in the "Bible Schools of America," many of them men of most marked scholarship, there is not a post-millennialist in the entire crowd, a positive proof that while men who study about the Bible may become skeptical, those who study the Bible itself, believe increasingly in its prophetic portions, and find in prophecy the very mould into which history will run, until the voices of heaven and earth shall unite in saying "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever."

What is the necessity of His personal return?

Men sometimes scoffingly ask, "Why should He come again? He is here now!" Here now representatively by His Holy Spirit; in person, no! but at the right hand of the Father, our High Priest at intercession; and in this age we need Him there. But when the Aaronic intercession was finished, then the High Priest clothed himself in glorious

garments and appeared in the midst of the people wearing the insignias of royalty. The reason for His coming again is in His own Word, He "has gone to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." The reason for His coming again is in the circumstance that when He returns the righteous dead will be raised. The reason for His return exists in the fact that when He comes the Jews shall "look upon him whom they have pierced, and mourn on account of him!" and their redemption shall once for all be accomplished in Christ; and a nation shall be born in a day. The reasons for His return are manifest in a world wild with confusion, reeking with anarchy, writhing with pain. If the real pressure of the world's agony can ever give impetus to the Advent prayer, the hour has struck for its increasing utterance. Since the late Dr. Augustus Strong was for forty years a most notable president of a theological seminary, his word ought to carry weight even with Moderns, and he said: "As the ancient world and its history were God's demonstration of human sin and of man's need of Christ's first advent, so this war is God's proof that science and philosophy, literature and commerce, are not sufficient for man's needs, and that Christ must again come, if our modern world is ever to be saved. 'In the fulness of time' Christ's first advent occurred. 'In the fulness of time' Christ's second advent will occur. But not until humanity, weary of its load, cries out for its redemption. 'How long, O Lord, how long?' It is not for us to know the times which the Father has

set within His own authority. But it is ours to believe in Christ's promise, and to pray for its speedy fulfillment. And so, I beg you to join with me in the one prayer with which our book of Scripture closes, namely, 'Lord Jesus, come quickly.'"

Men about this country have been asking, **"Why The Christian Fundamentals Association?"** The answer is at hand. It was created to oppose the false teaching of the hour, and by a renewed emphasis upon God's Revelation, to confirm the faith of the people, called to reveal to the world a new fellowship, a fellowship that is bringing into closer and closer union men from the various denominations who hold to the certain deity of Jesus Christ and to the utter authority of the Bible. It was called to back up those magazines and newspapers that have steadfastly espoused and propagated God's eternal truths; to strengthen and extend those colleges, Bible schools and theological seminaries that are remaining loyal to the great fundamentals of the divine revelation. The deliverances of this Association have sounded from shore to shore of the North American continent; and instead of expending themselves there, are winging their way across the seas, stimulating and strengthening the faith of all believing representatives in foreign lands. There is a prophecy of the day when "men shall come from the east and from the west, and from the north and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob." We are coming from every quarter of the earth to

affirm afresh that this prediction of prophecy is in prospect; and to enhearten our brethren at home and abroad with the sweet assurance of inspiration itself that "the Day of the Lord draweth nigh" and the hour has struck for the believers of the whole earth to "look up and lift up their heads" since **their "redemption** draweth nigh!"

NOTE: Read "Christianity is Christ" by Griffith Thomas. (Longmans—Publisher).

CHAPTER X

A SCEPTIC'S PHILOSOPHY AND THE SECOND COMING

A SCEPTIC'S PHILOSOPHY AND THE SECOND COMING

THE question of "the second coming of Christ," is, in its last analysis, a question of His deity. If He is truly the Son of God, and His every speech is an inerrant word, then He will come again. All dispute about it is a useless war of words. We cannot, therefore, consent to state our theme as another has recently done—"Will Christ Come Again?" for, to us, the deity of Christ is an established fact; and His word always and everywhere is divinely authoritative.

Our purpose, therefore, in this chapter is not so much that of convincing our readers concerning the second coming, as it is that of protecting them against certain false teachings, which are now looming large in public print. Among these, a tract entitled "Will Christ Come Again?" deserves more than usual attention, because of its multiplied attacks upon the dependableness of Christ, the integrity of Apostle and Prophet; in fact upon the authority of the Word. It has been freely and widely distributed and contains on its title page a promise of more of the same sort. We offered to reprint it in full at our own expense on condition of being privileged to combine with it our reply, and were declined on the ground of infringing the copyright; so we have decided not to mention the name of the man whose views we arraign before the bar of Biblical teaching.

It will suffice to name him "The Darwinian Sem-

inary Professor" and to arrange what we have to say under three heads: The Seminary Professor and the Second Coming; the Sacred Scriptures and the Second Coming; The Second Coming and the Signs of the Times.

THE SEMINARY PROFESSOR AND THE SECOND COMING.

With all due deference to both his profession and his position, and in perfect accord with his own sentiments, "We must speak plainly, though with regret, even if facts hurt." Against this professor we bring the following indictments: he employs utter misrepresentations; he revels in unscientific assumptions; he reaches anti-scriptural conclusions. In proof of these charges we appeal to his own speech.

He employs utter misrepresentations!

He charges premillennialism with being a propaganda "now heavily financed." The author knows better! If there is any considerable sum of money provided by any man or company of men in America, or any other country, for the express purpose of teaching premillennialism, the leading authors of books and articles upon this theme have been treated with neglect by the premillenarian millionaire or "Second Coming" Syndicate.

The explanation of the flood of literature upon this subject is found in two facts: 1st—The Sacred Scriptures inspire it; second, The Christian public demands it. Intelligent treatises upon this subject

find such ready sale, as to need no outside assistance!

Again, he lays the origin of premillenarianism to apocalyptic Jewish literature, written between 175 B. C. and the time of the Apostles. Another has already challenged him to produce such literature, and the public will wait for him to meet that demand.

He further declares that "whatever the New Testament records as having been the belief of early Christians," "the premillennialist accepts as infallible teaching," and "logically this ought to include a belief in a flat earth, the perpetuation of slavery, the submission to rulers like Nero, etc."

A careful reading of the New Testament will show that it never hints "a flat earth," that slavery is absolutely condemned, and was eventually abolished by its influence, and that rulers like Nero are only mentioned by it in condemnation.

When he charges the Anabaptists with having believed that Christ would come "in two years," he engages in a trick of oratory, namely that of trying to discredit a great doctrine by citing some exceptional and insane advocacy of the same.

When he indicts this doctrine as being divisive, he overlooks two important facts—first that every great truth is necessarily divisive. God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, Atonement, Regeneration, Sanctification—these all have produced bitter debate. Shall we discard them? Again the opponent of truth—not its advocate—is the divisive one. Æsop tells of the clapper that complained to the town

board against the crack in the bell. The Board was quite impressed with the complaint, until the Spirit of Diogenes, floating in, said, "Master Clapper, cease your complaining. You cracked the bell, it is poor taste for you to complain of it." Devotees of Darwinism have divided the church and are doing their best to destroy it utterly from the earth.

But the climax of misrepresentation is reached when he affirms, concerning premillenarians, that "they have refused to assist in government or in social reforms because they believed that it was God's will that the world should grow worse."

Historically, premillennialists have been as loyal to Government as any company of people, and no intelligent one of them ever believed it was "God's will the world should grow worse." Man's perverse way so utterly opposes God's will that He will eventually overthrow man's regime and give the world to the reign of His righteous Son!

He revels in unscientific assumptions.

The first of these is that "evolution is a science." Mr. Darwin did not so believe; he called it a "theory." Instructed men know the difference between science and theory. The latter must find demonstration in order to become the former; and for that the Darwinian philosophy waits—and will wait.

He assumes that because the world has gone on until now, it will continue as heretofore; and argues the progressive history of the past is a pledge of kindred history to be made. It was a

like assumption, backed by the assertions of SCIENTISTS, that buried forty thousand inhabitants in the ash-covered grave of St. Pierre. When Mt. Pelee, with her grass and tree-covered sides, and cup shaped top, filled with a peaceful lake, began to murmur and smoke, certain timid people who knew that a peaceful past history was not always a pledge of future security, fled from the vicinity. But Gov. Moutett, not proposing to be the subject of a mere superstition, appointed a commission "of scientific men" to investigate the mountain and report. They did their work with alacrity and reported with the assurance of scientists—"There was no danger from Mt. Pelee!" In order therefore, to quiet the foolish fears of ignorant people, and to save business from the stampede of possible alarmists, the Governor, with a military force about the city, kept the people within the confines of the same, and compelled them to go on with their wonted work. But on the morning of the second of May, 1902, the dictum of "scientific men" failed; the mountain itself exploded and the rain of death dropped upon the beautiful city and blotted it from the earth in one moment, and even Gov. Moutett and his family, and "the scientific commission," perished as promptly and as miserably as though the commission had never spoken! Some of us would a thousand times rather take issue with steaming Mt. Pelee than with the speech of the Son of God, or even with His inspired prophets.

Perhaps the most unscientific assumption to be found in the Professor's discussion is that the word

"imminent" means "immediate." No good student of dependable dictionaries or inspired apostles and prophets need fall into that error. According to the best dictionaries "immediate" means "without lapse of appreciable time"; and according to the same dictionaries "imminent" means "threatening to happen." When St. Pierre was destroyed every man in it, including even the slow-perceiving Governor and scientifically assured commission knew the "imminence" of that danger; but unfortunately for the citizens, neither the Governor nor the Commission believed in the "immediateness" of it.

Such a juggling with words is on no higher ethical plane than the conduct of the sleight-of-hand performer. A young man sometimes attends my church, and for the entertainment of his fellows he drops a red apple into his sleeve, and then immediately withdraws a living, kicking rabbit—to the amazement of the onlooking boys and girls! "See what a change!" he says, and some of the youngest of them believe the apple has turned into a rabbit, and one or two adults who are simple minded, may so suppose; but the keener and more intelligent, while admiring the deftness with which the trick is turned, laugh the statement to scorn. Such treatment awaits the professor's lightning word change.

But again the Professor asserts that "the early Christians believed that Jesus would return during the life-time of their generation." "This hope is on almost every page of the New Testament," he says.

Let us thank him here for the admission, that he means by "early Christians" New Testament writers! It is well to know what he means! But at the same time, let us remind his readers that his assertion is false to this great New Testament truth. Christ took pains to correct those uninspired disciples who thought "that the kingdom should IMMEDIATELY appear" by speaking the parable of "A certain Nobleman who went into a far-country to receive a kingdom and to return." Far countries are not shortly reached, and the return is not speedy.

Again, the same Lord uttered the parable of the vineyard let to husbandmen while he went into a far country "for a long time"—Luke 20:9. When in Matthew 24, they asked Jesus about the destruction of Jerusalem, His second appearance, and the end of the age, He prophesied history that has covered two thousand years for its fulfillment; and "the end is not yet!" He concluded that prophecy by reminding them "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness, unto all nations, before the end come." In John's Gospel we find that when there got abroad a saying among the brethren that John should not die until Jesus came, it was corrected, and the declaration is plainly written down that "Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die" but "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me!"

Paul, a voluminous writer upon the second coming, always speaks of it as in "the latter times" and refers to it as in "the last days." Writing to

the Hebrew Christians on this subject, he says "for ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry." (10:36) James enjoins upon the brethren of his day "Patience until the coming of the Lord." Peter seems to have known that time would last until this seminary professor had risen as one of the men of whom he wrote: "There shall come in the last day scoffers, saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (2 Pet. 3:3-4). Christ again, in another parable, declared that the delay would be so great that men would lose all hope of His coming, and resting future history upon the basis of past conduct, announce His delay, and, expecting to escape all accounting, exercise cruelty toward their fellows, to be themselves overtaken in turn by His sudden appearance and certain judgment.

It hardly seems essential now to discuss the third proposition: viz.—

He reaches anti-scriptural conclusions.

This has been well nigh adequately done. But it is necessary to add a few words of warning against a danger, far greater than denying the premillennial appearance of Christ, namely, the discrediting of Scripture! When a man admits concerning the hope of the premillennialist, "this hope is upon almost every page of the New Testament"

and then deliberately attempts to destroy that hope, he is, by the strictest logic, making an attempt upon the New Testament itself. "When the foundations are removed, what shall the righteous do?" No less destructive is the Professor's attempt to distinguish between what the Bible teaches and what its writers actually meant; and by his contention that "in order to get at the conceptions of these ancient men of God they have to be translated into modern conceptions exactly as the Greek or Hebrew language is to be translated into English" he practically puts the Bible out of existence for the great body of the people. Not one man in a thousand can translate the Hebrew or Greek language into English; we doubt if the Professor himself can do it; and if no more can translate the conceptions of New Testament teachers into modern thought, then our REVELATION is an ENIGMA and our GOSPEL is Greek indeed.

But we have given the Professor's view of the second coming more attention than it merits. So let us turn to a more profitable employment, and study

THE SACRED SCRIPTURES AND THE SECOND COMING

To some of us the Scriptures are the inspired word of God, infallible and inerrant, and they speak with authority! In them we find the settlement of controversy; their entrance "giveth light." According to these Scriptures, three things:

"He will come a second time without sin unto salvation."

A certain man in a Bible Conference declared the Scriptures taught that Christ would come again and again, but never "a second time!" We appeal to Hebrews 9:28, "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." If there was to be no re-appearance of Jesus except in spirit, it was the strangest speech He ever made when He declared, "And then shall they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with power and great glory;" and if there was to be no re-appearance of Jesus except in spirit, then Paul, writing to the Thessalonians, deceived them, when he said, "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God." As the eyes of disciples looked on Him in the act of ascent, so again shall He be visible in His re-appearance—"every eye shall behold Him"; as in that ascent He was attended by angels, so when He comes again ten thousand of His saints shall descend with Him; as in that ascent He was caught up in the clouds, so again shall "He come in clouds"; as He ascended from the mountain top, so in His descent "His feet shall stand upon Mt. Zion." He shall come again without sin unto salvation!

His appearance is to be both literal and personal.

When He spake of His re-appearance He was not

telling of the descent of the Spirit. The Bible everywhere differentiates between the Second Person of the Godhead and the Third Person. The Second Person, as our substitute, gives his life for the sheep; the Third Person is never spoken of as such, but is our Illuminator, our Inspirer, our Instructor. "He shall take of the things of Christ and show them unto us." "He shall guide us into all truth."

While Christ was here He pled with us. When the Third Person came, Christ went into Heaven to plead for us. His second appearance is not to be spiritual only, but literal.

To say that His second appearance means "death" is to destroy the meaning of language altogether, and involves men in that hopeless lack of logic which makes our Redeemer our Destroyer! Death is an enemy!—the last enemy that shall fade before the brightness of His re-appearance! That brilliant layman and great Bible student, Philip Mauro, said wisely and well, "One who undertakes to prove that Christ will not come again literally and personally must certainly seek his material elsewhere than in the Holy Scriptures. It is as easy to prove by the Scriptures that Christ did not come the first time, as to prove by them that He is not coming the second."

He comes to conquer the world and correct all wrong.

The relation of Paul to this doctrine has been disputed, but never by a true student of the Apos-

tle. To the Corinthians he wrote, of Christ, "He must reign until He hath put all enemies under His feet." It has been seriously objected that for Christ to "conquer," "overthrow," "put down," "subdue," is to prove God "incapable of bringing about His own victory by spiritual means, and compels Him to resort to physical brutality; to abandon morality and use miraculous militarism!" How strange for men who talk after that manner to tell us in the next breath and in defence of their evolutionary theory, that Christ came in the late war. Do they then take the position of the Kaiser that that war was really spiritual, that its brutality was not to be regarded in view of the blessed spiritual results that were the German objective, and that militarism becomes moral and spiritual when it is employed by them whose "might" makes it "right"? We call for consistency of conduct! The whole evolutionary principle, for which the Moderns are standing, the final accomplishment of which is said to be "the survival of the fittest" is true or false! If it be true, then the triumph of spiritual things are now taking place by militarism; if it be false, "the survival of the fittest" is not assured.

Some of us who have studied our Bibles until we are assured that Darwinism is a doctrine of devils, that God will never put His moral sanction upon the proposition that "might is right", believe that when Jesus Christ does come to overthrow the Adversary, He will not do it at all on the ground that "might is right" nor employ a "miraculous

militarism" in order to secure a personal and preferred success. He will do it, however, on the solitary basis that God has offered to men spiritual means and they have refused them; made to men spiritual appeal and they have rejected it; proffered men a spiritual reign, and they have overthrown it. And when at last, by a deliberate choice, and foul misjudgment, they have muddled the age, baptized the world in blood, and brought mankind to the verge of self-destruction, He will send His Son to recover righteousness, restore peace, and introduce a reign of love in spiritual as well as material subjugation, in a world which had long been savagely enslaved by Satan.

The final method will be a method of force, but it will be the force of God himself, and hence the force of righteousness expressed in an infinite affection and amplified in appointments of infinite wisdom.

Instead of premillennialists opposing a social Gospel, we anticipate the time when a social gospel shall have its opportunity, when the sweet social purpose for which the suffering Christ has always stood, will be the world's universal weal; when wealthy corporations and body-pinched laborers will not turn faces, the one from the other, but every man shall "sit under his own vine and fig tree," when the prince and the peasant will no longer look, each at the other, with increasing suspicion, but when they shall dwell together as brothers and know as little mutual bitterness; when the stalking lions of the age shall no longer seek as

prey the lambs of the same, but the strong and the weak shall fellowship, the latter confidently trusting the affections of the former; when culture shall cease to be the experience of the few whose very conceit of it shall destroy the peace of the world and threaten the extinction of all, but the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, and all men shall be instructed, and correspondingly spiritually subjected.

Yes, we have a social and a national program! But it is a program that puts the Prince of Peace at the head of affairs, rather than eternally trusting the world to blood-thirsty and battle-loving kings and kaisers, czars and presidents.

But a further thought before we finish:

THE SECOND COMING AND THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Our Professor's admission that a flood of literature upon this subject is "partially because of the late war" is true; and yet the war, as an incident of the age, is significant in the last degree. Some things the most stupid dimly see. Certain things Scripture students are clearly seeing. To three of these let me call attention in conclusion:

The prophetic scriptures are being rapidly fulfilled.

The days have come when "disobedience to parents" marks the approaching end. The days have come when "irreverence for sacred things" is as current as the printed page. The days have come

when "the love of most grows cold" because of the lustful atmosphere in which men live. The days have come when false "christs" are announcing themselves, and "prophets" of a bloodless gospel have been multiplied. The days have come when "war and rumors of war" fill the world; the hour has struck when "nation has risen against nation"; the days have come when "famine and pestilence" are the fears of all men. The days have come when the peace-loving of the earth are no longer privileged their convictions, but are compelled to do battle or languish in prison! The days have come when the Jews—Christ's brethren—are suffering as perhaps never before in their history; and when the Christians of the earth are being slaughtered in mighty numbers. History is running into the mould of prophecy. Only a few years ago great scientists, adopting the historical method, exercising the Darwinian hope, delivering wisdom to the waiting crowds, declared that "another world-war was impossible." World economy would not admit of it; modern mechanical devices rendered it too dangerous; statesmanship had become too astute; scholarship had certainly set itself in opposition; the growth of socialism rendered it unlikely, if not impossible; and above all, the triumph of Christian civilization was an absolute assurance against a world war! What is scholarship; what is statesmanship; what is philosophy; what is so-called Christian civilization, when once they are pitted against the Word of God? "Prophecy is certain: the interpretation thereof is sure!"

Second: The whole world is waiting in strange expectation.

The secular press is more disposed to-day to admit that something, heretofore unknown and undreamt, is about to strike the world than is many a skeptical preacher. The new theology of Germany has effectually undone many an American pulpit and disabled many an American minister. The philosophy of Nietzsche, combined with the Gospel of Christ, is as leaven in the measure of meal, and good as the latter was before the combination was effected, it is in a state of corruption wherever that is once accomplished. But while these false prophets are crying, "Peace!" "Peace!" the world itself, with its utter instinct for God, is waiting and watching for the next great movement, and actually believes it is nigh! There was a kindred expectation in it when Christ came the first time. That feeling amounted to wondering bewilderment in the minds of unbelievers, but reached the heights of faith with those who knew God.

The very same conditions exist now. Everywhere we hear it! On trains, the men discuss it! In hotel lobbies they are asking one another "What next?" Passers in the street are saluting one another with the query, "Don't you think the end of the age is drawing nigh?"

Oh, the tragedy of an hour like this, when the world, still weltering in human blood, dying in unbelief, is looking to men who wear the garments of prophets, and asking "Watchman, what of the

night?" to get either no answer at all or else one that involves misdirection and death! When St. Pierre was about to be visited with the fires that fall from heaven, burning out the last breath of life, two women in that city asked their husbands for advice. One of them said, "Dear, it is dangerous to abide here; we will go." He saved himself and his house! The other, a wonderfully well-instructed man, a man known for his brilliancy, an American statesman, scorned the "superstition" of the woman who asked him the way, and a day later saw her perish miserably at his side.

One sin I pray God to save me from, and that is the sin of crying to a sinful people "Peace!" "Peace!" when there is but portending judgment.

Finally, the earth and the heavens may shortly stir to the same spirit.

If I understand my Bible, the earthquakes of the past are but types of one that is yet to take place. When the sixth seal opens, and it will, continents will be moved out of their places, as Martinique was shaken in its every part, and as the sun above that island blackened, so the sun over every continent "will become as black as sackcloth of hair" and "the full moon as blood," and "every mountain and every island will move." It is a strange thing to say the least, that the greatest earthquakes that have ever shaken this globe have come, for the most part, within a half century. The most awful catastrophes that have ever visited the earth have taken place within twenty-five years! J. H. Welch

tells us that the destructive work of Mt. Vesuvius was very small as compared with that of Mt. Pelee. La Soufriere poured forth volumes of death only three days later. The description he gives of the people, pitifully attempting to hasten to places of safety, the thousands that writhed as the fires from heaven leaped upon them, to leave not a vestige of life, of those who leaped from vessels into the sea to find the ocean itself a boiling pot, and the agonizing cries that were heard above the roar of the thunderous, moulten, burning mountain, reminds one indeed of the day of prophecy when "the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free man, shall hide themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and say to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of His wrath is come; and who is able to stand?"

It is to prepare you against that day; it is to make that day a day of calm for you, a day when no uncertainty shall smite the heart, no unbelief shall film the soul, that I speak. What a marvelous difference there will be when that day breaks between the men and the women who see in the face of Him who appears the saving face of a Friend and of those who behold in Him a dread Judge of sin!

To show how calmly that day may be met, let me quote from the letter written by a beautiful

young girl on that very day when Mt. Pelee became the destroyer of those who had dwelt snugly at its base. In the midst of the excitement that was on every side, she wrote to a friend saying "My calmness astonishes me. I am waiting the event tranquilly. My only suffering is from the dust, which penetrates everywhere. Mamma is not a bit anxious. We are all calm! If death awaits us, there will be a numerous company to leave the world. Will it be by fire or asphyxia? It will be what God wills! You have our last thoughts. Tell Brother Robert that we are still alive. This will, perhaps, be no longer true when this letter reaches you!"

Oh! to have a calmness like that when Christ shall come; yea to have a calmness infinitely above that because one sees in Him not the Executioner of death but the certain Lord of life: that is worth while! That, we believe, will be the portion of them that put their trust in Him; of them that accept His Word as true, and wait for "His revelation from Heaven!"

N. B. Read "Ecce Venit" by A. J. Gordon, "I am Coming" by Jas. H. Brooks. "The Evolution of the Kingdom" by W. B. Riley.

CHAPTER XI

PROPHECY AND THE APPROACHING KINGDOM

PROPHECY AND THE APPROACHING KINGDOM

Micah 4:1-7.

THIS text has come to the time of its inning. The man to whom, in the light of present events, it does not appeal in a new and magnificent meaning, is a poor, if not a stupid student of Scripture. For several years two themes have occupied and even dominated the thought of the entire world, and the two are one—War and Peace. Magazines, books, newspapers, have centralized upon these subjects; they could do no other. They have become the all-absorbing theme of all thought, and the controlling motive of individual, social and national conduct. Micah, the Prophet of God, dwelt in troublous times, and sickening of the smoke and cloud and fog, and its resultant depression and fear, he climbed the mount and stood in the upper, clearer air, and looked out over the ages to see whether the future would be better, whether "the last days" would improve upon his own day, and the vision he caught was both disconcerting and comforting. It showed no improvement in man, but it did reveal the marvelous and blessed plan of God.

To three things set forth by the Prophet let me call your attention: The Last Days: The Last War: and The Last King.

THE LAST DAYS.

"In the last days it shall come to pass" Micah 4:1. Who can tell what the last days are? Who can

determine when they began and when they will end? Beyond all doubt God has divided time at one point. The first days were the days before Christ came, and the last days are the days sweeping in between His appearance in humility and His re-appearance in glory. It is difficult to dispute the time of their beginning: it is more difficult to deny the time of their end. Peter fixed the time of their beginning, quoting from the Prophet Joel —"It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions, and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit, and they shall prophesy." Peter said of the pentecost, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel". It is evident, however, that "the last days" are to have "their last days;" that the very latter time, the closing of this dispensation, is fairly and fully set forth in Scripture, and Micah seems to have had that brief concluding period in mind—the last of the last days—or the end of this age.

If we understand him clearly, there are certain characteristics of the last of "the last days" that will mark them: there are certain conversions of "the last days" that are assured, and there is a certain kind of education that will be accomplished in "the last days."

The characteristics of the last days. One method of Bible study indulged by Mr. Moody, and often advised by him, was the topical method.

Any man would be profited who followed it, and "the last days" would be an interesting theme. If you take your Concordance and run it through, you will find "mockers" will come in the last days (Jude 18), men who make light of the faith, and who especially laugh to scorn the second coming of Christ (2 Pet. 3:3); you would also find that the last days will be characterized by "perilous times" (2 Tim. 3:1) that the last days will be marked by "false prophets" (Matt. 24:11) false Christs (Matt. 24:24), "wars, rumors of wars, famines, pestilence, earthquakes" (Matt. 24:1-14); the last days are also characterized by "disobedience to parents," unthankfulness, unholiness (2 Tim. 3:2). It must be conceded that the world has seldom seen more Scriptural signs of "the last days" than now characterize it. We have the mockers: the Second Coming is spoken and written against. We have "disobedience" "unthankfulness" and "unholiness." We have false christs and false prophets. Men are denying the blood that bought them. The nations of the earth planned to war; they expected to war; they compelled history to run into "the mould of prophecy", that "the last days" might be exactly as God said they would be. Christ, then, was no false prophet—"In the last days there shall be wars and rumors of war," and if these be not the very last, then greater wars yet remain to deluge the world with blood, and the day will break when two hundred million of men will bear arms in the fulfillment of prophecy (Rev. 9:16).

But Micah, being a true prophet of God is not the special exponent of pessimism. We have already said that he saw things that were disconcerting; but he saw, equally, things that were encouraging and inspiring.

The conversions of the last days! He saw the house of the Lord established in the top of the mountains, and exalted above the hills, and the people flowing into it. He saw the nations coming, and saying, Let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths." vs. 2.

The notable premillennial brethren of England, in the Manifesto which they put forth some years since, expressed their absolute confidence that "in the last days there would be an out-pouring of the Spirit upon all flesh,"—a time of wonderful revival and redemption. There are people who think we are just now on the eve of that revival; and there are some who contend that the late war itself produced it. For a brief time the most popular pulpit men in all political and war circles were the very men who were saying that the late world-war was a world-wide revival of religion and eventuated in wholesale redemption such as the earth had not seen. We were told that, looking Death in the face, men turned from the sight of his horrid features to God. We were told that chaplains, Y. M. C. A. secretaries and camp pastors undertook more for men than was ever undertaken, since man had a beginning on the earth. We were

told that the fruit of this combined endeavor, associated as it was with the marvelous work of the Red Cross, and all the ameliorating influences inspired by the scenes of suffering and death, were spiritual in nature and character, and tended to lead men to God.

Far be it from me to speak one disparaging word against the magnificent endeavor that was made for men in the world conflict; God honored the work of the true secretary, and the true camp pastor, and of the true chaplain and nurse, but one of the sanest articles that I saw from the pen of any man called attention to certain great facts that are too often overlooked by the impassioned orator who loves the hand-clap and knows how to secure the same. He said "So far as facts can be ascertained from those, both in official and unofficial position as Christian workers with the armies, there was nothing strikingly religious in the life of our soldiers. It goes without saying that they were magnificently courageous, careless of all danger, inspired with splendid passion, and governed by a high sense of honor. But these things are not necessarily an expression of Christian faith and purpose. To the great majority the spiritual nature of the conflict in which they were engaged is simply unrecognized. Familiarity with death has by no means produced anything like a general sense of the need of Divine protection. The mission of amusement was considerably overdrawn. *** Is there not something wrong in that conception of the serious realities of life at such a time,

which expresses itself in an unwearied round of entertainments? And was not positive harm done to men who were thus familiarized with a type of so-called Christian work in which anything like definite religion was almost apologized for?" If there was ever a time when the Church of God should emphasize evangelism it is the very moment when that practice of a social gospel, which is a poor substitute for the shed blood, is in the ascendant. No! this revival will come in "the last days," but it will not be the consequence of war. Micah does not so state; nor did he so believe. It will have an altogether different source; an altogether different inspiration will characterize the period of final peace! But it will come; as surely as there is a God in Heaven it will come! And, nations shall come and say, "Let us come up to the mount of God and to the house of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths." It is a blessed promise; it is a bright prospect; it is as sure as the speech of the eternal God himself: it is His speech; and it will come to pass!

The education of the last days! With it then will come a new kind of education for "the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." The one reason why wars continue, the one reason why man has lost respect for his brother, disregarded the virtue of his sister; the one reason why the human hyena has triumphed over humanity itself, is the doctrine of evolution, leading us to suppose we could make great men and

build up great nations by the way of physical and mental development. We have supposed that magnificent muscle and trained minds would produce the Darwinian dream of a "super-man," and it has all been as false as the philosophy of Satan who suggested it and the Huns who have been its ablest exponents, and the world could never have gotten a better illustration of the utter lie contained in that conception, than Germany produced. Her men were men of perfect muscle; their stockily built forms were the fear of their opponents, and their well-nigh universal education the despair of competing nations. And yet their neglect of the law, and their discrediting of the word of the Lord left the brute in the ascendant, trampled the very breath from the body of Christianity, and left the Fatherland the form thereof without its power—a state religion still wearing the name of Christ, from which the Son of God, grieved to death, had long since departed. The most wretched theology that has characterized and cursed man in twenty centuries has been making in Germany for the last fifty years, and imported to every part of the earth. No, we do not educate a man properly when we begin and end with his muscle: we do not educate a man properly when we add his mind to his muscle: we do not educate him acceptably to God when we set the key note of his learning to anything else than the experimental and the spiritual, and when the last days come, and God bares his arm to give to the world an illustration of what He can do, you will see a

new system of learning introduced, and the Bible will not be banished from the public schools, refused a hearing in the State Universities, discredited and scoffed in the denominational schools, neglected and forgotten by individuals and families, but, "the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." And as Germany has boasted her culture—referring to the head of man—the world will then boast a new education, but the reference will be to the heart and to a knowledge of the living God, which alone can make wise unto salvation. Thank God that that education shall characterize the last days, "For the Law shall go forth of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

But our text tells us also of

THE LAST WAR

Vss. 3-5: "And He shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off, and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid: for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it. For all people now walk every one in the name of his god, and we will then walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and ever."

There are some features of this prophecy that the church of this period needs to dwell upon.

Let me call your attention to three of them.

1. **"The Lord shall bring peace to this world."** He shall judge the nations; * * * he shall rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." There was a meeting in Minneapolis a while ago, held in the name of Christ, with great men sitting in it, representatives of a great denomination, and they drafted a Resolution and sent it to our great President (then Pres. Wilson), asking him, if possible, to restore to the world a lasting peace. Alas! Alas! Men have not yet looked to the real power for peace; they are still depending upon their poor fellows instead of depending upon the mighty God. It is a vain dependence! President Wilson of America and the power back of him might compel a temporary world-truce but as for *lasting* peace, that remains with the Lord, and with Him alone, and it is a profound pity when men who are supposed to be preachers of the Word point their fellows to any other source for lasting peace, or let them look to any other person than that of our coming King. Joseph Parker that remarkable London minister, once said, "The thing to be remembered is this, you can never have peace until you have righteousness." And then he illustrates—"Only one thing can carry the earth and that is gravitation. Gravitation will pick it up; but your hands cannot, your institutions cannot; your politics cannot; only one thing keeps the universe right, and sends it whirling through its musical revolutions, and that is

gravitation. Gravitation can pick up a thousand universes, and hold them all."

But what is gravitation? God's right arm, and He who can hold the universe in His own right hand, can with His lips, speak to the storm-swept world as He spake to the little lake of Galilee, "Peace be still" and instantly its winds and its waves shall obey Him. The LORD shall bring peace to the world.

The Lord shall bring prosperity to the world. It is when He judges among the people and rebukes strong nations and compels swords to be converted into plowshares, and spears into pruning hooks, and pronounces a permanent peace, that they "sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree;" and "none make them afraid." That is another lesson we need now to learn. Already we are crying reconstruction and education. We need education the world over and we need new methods. We are under the necessity of rebuilding shattered men, and we are under the necessity of revamping commerce, and some of our great financiers have already prophecied the most remarkable period of prosperity the world has ever seen. They expect the new national alliances, the new forms of education, the new means of transportation, to compass it all, and the greedy are getting ready now to get richer now that the war is over, and men in America expect our country to forge to the front in all relations, and become the dominating commercial power of the world. In all probability she may, and if so, and the Lord delay His com-

ing, that prosperity will not be attended by anything akin to this text, will not produce that new social order in which each man shall be a landholder, it will not even effect that peace in which man is content to "sit every man under his own vine and fig tree," where none shall make afraid. It will have in it all the old elements of trial and sweat and oppression and contention and hatred and hell. I am not enamored of the prospect of what can be accomplished in the world that makes its god a god of gold; I am not at all charmed by the promise of commercial advantages such as the world has never seen, when the description of them makes no mention of my Christ and gives little or no consideration to His cause, and if any greater calamity could befall our country than to have the war followed by another period of unprecedented prosperity in which prayers should continue to wane, and Bible study continue to be neglected, and spiritual exercises continue to decline, and spiritual experiences grow increasingly seldom, and in which "every man walks in the name of his god", and makes his god Venus, Bacchus, or Gambrinus, according to the pulsing appeals of his own passions! I want to see peace come to the world, and it will come! for "the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." I want to see prosperity the portion of every man—and it will be so, for that He also hath said; but I want the realization of the Prophet's further vision,

The Lord shall have praise from the whole world.

"And we will walk in the name of the Lord our

God forever." The last war will not come to this earth while the Lord himself is absent from it, and while men are not deeply concerned about the bringing back of our King. Prosperity will never be the portion of all men while kings and czars and potentates sit on man-made thrones and administer in man-made laws, and despise alike God and His Word. I was in sympathy with the peace aims of the "Disarmament Conference" and I think no greater folly was ever indulged than that which slaughtered men by the millions, and which, in the end, will enrich no country nor give higher supremacy to any potentate; but I know my Book too well to expect that either peace or prosperity will be the universal portion until men have turned from their false gods and are ready to pay tribute to Him who alone sitteth upon the circle of the heavens, and His administration is the lone administration of this world; and that day will come when the Lord comes. In other words, the reappearance of the Lord Christ will speedily end the last war.

Let us hope then, that we approach the further fulfillment of Micah's portion of the vision and the

THE LAST KING.

"In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted; and I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast far off a strong nation: and the Lord shall reign over them in mount Zion from henceforth, even for ever."

Three things in conclusion:

The Lord shall be the last King. The men that now sit upon the thrones of the earth are concerned about their successors. They want their sons to sit where they have sat, and their sons sons to come in the order; they want to keep the throne in the family circle, and they would like to know who would be their successor even in the unborn centuries. I can tell them—"the Lord shall reign," and either they themselves, or their sons, or their grandsons, shall finally abdicate in His behalf, and turn over the governments of the world to Him.

Dr. Joseph Parker, in his "People's Bible" interprets this language of the Prophet as meaning that "the Church is to be the uppermost institution, the sanctuary of God is to be at the top of things, and out of it is to come law; out of it also is to come the spirit of righteousness, and out of it, day by day, is to come the spirit of peace, the spirit of benediction." The Prophet was not thinking of the church at all; he was not thinking of administration of the church in this age; he was speaking of the King, and of His personal reign in the earth; and in anticipation of that glad day, he struck the very harps of Heaven to music. The theme of their pæan was—"The Lord shall reign!"

"Kingdom of Peace, whose music clear
Swept through Judea's starlit skies,
Still the harsh sounds of human strife
Break on thy heavenly harmonies.
Yet shall thy song of triumph ring
In full accord, from land to land,
And men with angels learn to sing:
'Behold, the Kingdom is at hand.'"

Another thing that the Prophet made clear is this:

Under the last King Israel shall have central place. "I will assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted; and I will make her that halteth a remnant, and her that was cast far off a strong nation:" The Germans began the late war expecting to make themselves a strong nation: England continues to hope to make herself the strong nation. America has taken a hand in it, and the average American confidently believes that in the final windup of all things, this will be the great and glorious country, and that the American people will be under the favor of God. These sentiments are natural and are so patriotic that one hates to disturb them, but my Book does not so read. Germany shall not have dominion, England shall not control, America shall not rule; but a nation that is now weak, that is now scattered to the ends of the earth, without a land in which to dwell, a city to become her capital, or even a flag floating for her protection, will become the people of God. Jerusalem now attracts the attention of the world, the land of Palestine is now in possession of the Jew. History runs into the mould of prophecy and the day may be nigh at hand.

> "Oh, then that I might live, to see
> The olive bear her proper branches,
> Which now lie, scattered each where
> And with root and sap decay
> Cast by the Husbandman away,
> And sure it is not far."

Finally, **His kingdom will be,—the last and the lasting kingdom.** When Daniel had his vision of the ages he saw four great empires destined to fall in turn—The Babylonian Empire, represented by the golden head of the great image, the Medo-Persian empire represented by the breast and arms of silver, the Grecian empire, represented by the belly and thighs of brass, and the great Roman empire by the iron legs. After that His vision revealed the toes, or the little nations that were to grow out from the Roman empire as the toes grow from the feet, and when they perish it is to give place to His Kingdom. "The Lord himself should reign from Mount Zion, from henceforth even forever!" And that is the Empire of the future—that is the kingdom to come, and in that kingdom the Utopian dreams of the centuries will find their fulfillment, and the lasting peace for which we pray its perfect consummation. John Foster tells us that in the time of William Wallace, a daring freebooter infected the seaports of Scotland. In approaching a port he ran up a blood-red flag, marked by skull crossbars which spread universal dismay. Wallace resolved to rid the seas of this cruel scourge. He fitted out a merchantman with rich lading, as if for a cruise, but filled the spaces between the decks with armed men. The pirate gave chase, overhauled and expected to make the rich prize an easy prey. Wallace's men awaited the signal to spring upon them, which they did, captured their leader, and hung him at the yard-arm. He burned the pirate ship and, taking the crew in

chains, set sail for the city of Perth, flying the captured flag of the pirate at his peak. The people saw the dreaded emblem, and rang the bells of the town to give the alarm. As he neared the dock he ran up the Scotch flag above the pirate's emblem of blood and plunder. The report soon spread through the excited city of the capture of the pirate, and William Wallace the hero of Scotland, was hailed as his country's deliverer.

Too long the world has been plundered by its enemy. Its true Friend must shortly come and under His mighty hand must go into captivity every enemy of God and right; and above all the flags of warring lands He will lift the blood stained banner of His own cross and let it float before the faces of men—the double symbol of His conquest and their security. Oh, what a day it will be for afflicted people when that crimson flag displaces all national emblems and floats as a pledge of eternal security.

Hark! ten thousand harps and voices
Sound the note of praise above;
Jesus reigns, and heaven rejoices;
Jesus reigns, the God of love:
See, he sits on yonder throne;
Jesus rules the world alone.

Jesus, hail! whose glory brightens
All above, and gives it worth:
Lord of life, thy smile enlightens,
Cheers, and charms thy saints on earth:
When we think of love like thine,
Lord, we own it love divine.

Saviour, hasten thine appearing;
Bring, O bring the glorious day,
When, the awful summons hearing,

Heaven and earth shall pass away:
Then, with golden harps we'll sing,
"Glory, glory to our King."

Note Read
"The Coming Prince" by Sir Robert Anderson.
"Maranatha—or the Lord Cometh" by J. H. Brookes.
"Jesus is Coming" by W. E. Blackstone.

CHAPTER XII

MODERNISM—OR THE CHALLENGE OF ORTHODOXY

MODERNISM—OR THE CHALLENGE OF ORTHODOXY

BIBLE Conferences on Christian Fundamentals have converted the professing church into a boiling pot. The great meeting at Philadelphia some years ago expressed Orthodoxy's stand against increasing skepticism, and if the current of that deluge was not turned, it was at least stayed. Now its spirit of resentment rises as threateningly as does that of a thwarted stream. Time will show that while Bible Schools and multiplied Bible Conferences have checked destructive criticism, our hope against its further ravages rests in those embankments that may be builded of Bible truths.

Increasingly the professing church parts into two camps; and they are not, as men imagine, Papist on the one side and Protestant on the other; that division is more and more a matter of history and of name. They are, instead, Modernism on the one side and Evangelicalism on the other; the Heterodox against the Orthodox, the Infidel against the Believer; and between them is an impassable gulf. The opinions that dominate these camps express savage alienation. On that rock of alienation the craft of the "Interchurch" went to pieces; and on the same rock, every evangelical denomination is grounding. This remark may excite the cry "Pessimism!" but the Prophet is more concerned with truth than with terms. Truly the crisis to which the church has come is a challenge to orthodoxy.

THE CRISIS OF THE CHURCH.

The existence of a church crisis is commonly conceded. Only a few years since to speak of "The Crisis of the Church" was to be called "an alarmist;" was to be charged with attempt at cheap notoriety. The Evolutionist, convinced that he had come all the way from an invisible monad to an incomprehensible man, that society had marked progress from the chatter of the Jungle to the voice of human law and order, that religion had evolved from prayers to the spirit of darkness which made one afraid, to Jehovah—the tribal deity of the Jew—was equally certain that tomorrow he would be the superman with a super religion,—the brotherhood of man.

Nine long years of battle and blood, of unrest and revolution, of social disaster and national degeneration, sufficed to shake this *sang froid* and compel men who think at all, to wonder and question, and in proportion to their depth of thought, even to "fear those things that are coming upon the earth." One is profoundly impressed with the fact that suddenly those who hitherto have been regarded as utter opponents are compelled to employ kindred speech. You expect, from such a paper as "The Alliance Weekly" of New York, committed to premillennialism, the declaration, "Momentous movements are coming to a crisis and must be dealt with by the Judge of all the earth. The world is rapidly ripening for judgment. * * * The age is money mad and pleasure

polluted;" but we find that they are not alone in the use of excited language. The Christian Herald is a favorite with calm men, and they advertised themselves a while ago to the world with a big headline, "A Crisis Hour has come into History. Thrilling events of universal interest are crowding upon one another's heels. Ancient monarchies and systems of evil on the one hand and enlightened modern governments on the other hand are in deadly conflict," etc. It is well known that those outstanding Baptist leaders who have had the most to do with "The New World Movement"—men to whom anything like spiritual alarm is as detestable as the Genesis "theory" of creation,—have nevertheless, either lost their calm or else come to new convictions, for they took a page in the Saturday Evening Post to declare "A Crisis exists today," and even fall into the frenzied speech—"The wolves of license, greed, materialism in all its forms, are leaping at civilization's throat—at Mankind's moral self." More remote still from moral or spiritual hysteria would one imagine those thirty-four bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church who guided the Quadrennial General Conference through the Des Moines sessions, and yet, they declared that "the church is on trial and at a crisis," saying "If we fail here it will not matter what else we do. We cannot go back to less troubled, more simple, placid days." And they remark "In this materialistic age the church seeks spiritual ends, with the eternal value of human life in view. More than ninety per cent of the present laws relate to property; less

than ten per cent to the interests of human life. The emphasis is wrong and the proportion vicious." And they conclude, "Never before did a General Conference meet at a time like this."

When we reach the world itself, we find its accustomed complacency has departed. A great Trust Company publishes a monthly paper of considerable proportions, and in one issue they say, "Social unrest is world-wide * * * It presents the greatest problem with which the peoples of the former belligerent nations have to contend. * * * The world is undergoing a painful re-adjustment, but it is in such confusion that it is essential for all classes of citizens to unite in a strong effort to increase output everywhere." For once in human history, pessimism or no pessimism, post-millennialists are speaking the premillennial shibboleth, and the seers of the world have adopted the speech of Scripture, and history is running "into the mould of prophecy!" "Perilous times" have come!

This crisis has been precipitated by philosophy.

For years this term, which in its very etymology, expresses the egoism of the man employing it, has increasingly disputed the supremacy of Scripture. Adopted by Kant as a medium of his skepticism, and by Darwin as the vehicle of his professed science, it has assayed, in both Teutonic and English speaking nations, to set aside and supplant Scripture; and, for the time, and with the superficial it has largely succeeded. School men, removed for the most part from the great practical problems of life, and so

limited by the four walls of a library as to have no proper perspective, have become at once its subjects and patrons, and by their constant fellowship with students, have branded the rising generation with Kantian and Darwinian beliefs, and brought the world to the verge of utter infidelity. This philosophy recognizes not the God of the Bible,—personal Creator of all men and of all things,—it denies the claims of inspiration set forth by the Scriptures, repudiates every sacred page as a source of binding authority, calls into question the virgin birth, the miracle workings, meaningful death, inexplicable resurrection, the reputed ascension of Christ, in other words all the fundamental features of His deity; treats with contempt the great social guides that have come from these supernatural and spiritual sources, and presents to us as the final basis of faith, "The survival of the fittest," with its promise of the "superman."

It was that philosophy, adopted by Nietzsche and for full thirty years made the basis of all German education, that finally fruited in the late war, baptized the world in blood, gave birth to Bolshevism, wrought irreparable injustice to the doctrine of brotherhood and left the whole earth wondering whether, after all, it had a God! Metaphysics was once described by a shrewd critic as "A Scotch mist" and another described "psychology" as "a modern mirage." But it has remained for philosophy to prove itself "a gas" more poisonous than any that Germany ever loosed against the Allies. It is claimed for certain fumes, thought out and

wrought out in Teutonic laboratories, that when released they took their way over tops and thru trenches and left, in their wake, thousands of young men suffocating, strangling, blackening, biting the dust and dying. These fumes not only filled the lungs, crowding out the air divinely-adapted, but they seared lips, blistered nostrils, burned eyes, ate into the flesh, until nothing conceivable in mortal agony remained to be suffered. What these fumes were to physical men, modern philosophy is proving itself to be to men's souls. Wherever it has gone, the Holy Spirit—symbolized by the air itself—has been driven out, the vision of truth and of God has been blurred, blackness of infidelity has filmed the soul; and that spiritual death which they suffer, who forget God, has ensued. I have read some reports of suffering on the battle field that harrowed my very soul, but I doubt if any physical agony equals that distress of mind and struggle of spirit through which he passes from whose youthful heart a modern professor, by a philosophy "falsely so called," has taken both God and His Word.

This crisis involves the whole Christian program. You may take any declaration of Faith you please, put forth by a modern evangelical body, and follow its articles from the first to the last, and you will not find one of them left intact. Modernists who are professors in our evangelical denominational schools, and later graduates who go from their feet to occupy evangelical pulpits, have not left undisputed a single declaration of our holy faith. They deny that "the Holy Bible was written by men di-

vinely inspired;" they scorn the thought that "It is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction;" they openly deny that it has "God for its Author;" and they resent with fervor the claim that "It contains the truth without any admixture of error." They deny the God that we believe to be "the One and only Creator and Ruler of the universe," even Jehovah, making Him "the tribal God of the Jews;" and when the flight of oratory demands more dignified expression they speak of Him as "that mysterious ultimate which we call God." They resent the declaration that "man was created in holiness, but by transgression fell from that happy and holy estate, and involved himself and his posterity in sin;" teaching on the contrary, that by a process of evolution man has come, by his own effort, over the impassable stretch from animal life to the high and moral plane upon which he is now found.

If we speak of "the way of salvation" they will not have it that Salvation of sinners "is of grace" through the mediatorial offices of the Son of God. To quote the language of one of them; "Such a theory of the atonement finds no foothold in my consciousness or my reason." As to Justification, they repudiate the notion that it comes in consequence of faith, and, in express contradiction of the Bible, insist that "it can only be by works." As to Regeneration, that is not with them a super-work, wrought by the Holy Spirit, but subjective changes imposed by one's self-thought. Concerning Repentance and Faith, they cannot concede the ne-

cessity of the first, saying it is out of harmony with the evolution theory, nor adopt the Biblical definition of the second believing that the God of the Bible is largely the creation of man's mind. Concerning Sanctification, it is, in their judgment, of self, rather than by the Spirit, and their definition of the Perseverance of the Saints would take the form of human plodding rather than Divine preservation. The Ordinances, to these men, are matters of little or no moment; the Church is a human agency that has voluntarily accepted the program of world improvement; the Great Commission to them is only a social message; as to the Resurrection, they teach that when death overtook some who had hoped to have part in the Kingdom, this thought was invented to save them for that participation, and as for Heaven, the idea gradually developed with the abandonment of the social hope of the early Christians; the Final Judgment is a fiction of apocalyptic writers!

Some time ago, eighteen preachers, whose known leanings toward Modernism had made their Sabbath services acceptable to the Chicago University, were united in a volume of sermons. One of the most capable writers of the South said of the output, "The sermons are beautifully written; they are academic; some of them seemed to make a pathetic effort to speak the language of Zion, but mostly they utter the dialect of Ashdod. For the most part they frankly and finally abandon evangelistic views. Doctrine is discounted, theology is underrated and berated; religion is ostensibly valued,

but ill-defined; there is in them no clear presentation of Christ as Savior; their musings about God are sentimental and indefinite; many of them have denied the inspiration of the New Testament, and the reality of the atonement. The true Deity, Christ's resurrection, reign and coming again, and other accepted beliefs of evangelical Christianity they relegate to the dogmatic scrap-heap. In fact, it is a book of philosophy and not of religion."

Therein is our crisis explained, and therein is the

CHALLENGE OF ORTHODOXY.

One might imagine from what has been said that modernism has wholly captured the Church. On the contrary, we are confident that, as yet, it has made but slight inroads. It perhaps would not be an over-statement to claim nine-tenths of the active church membership of evangelical churches in America for evangelical Christianity. Up to the present moment, modernists have busied themselves almost wholly in subjugating the schools and in capturing key-laymen. There they have seen their greatest success. Modernism reasons well that, once the schools in hand, and a few key-laymen, the churches will quickly capitulate. With a modernist in every pulpit, modernism will mark rapid progress in the pew. That is the new Jesuitry! The reasoning is sound; the results are not debatable! But if God is not dead, neither is Orthodoxy! Its time has come; its chance is on! The very challenge of the hour should invite to determined conquest.

The term Orthodoxy needs reaffirmation. It requires no new definition! It still stands for "correctness in doctrine," for "soundness in Biblical teaching." This word, by its very staunchness of character, tempts opponents to scorn. Failing to discredit it by reasoning, they are found now subjecting it to ridicule; all of which argues for its retention and its re-emphasis. Let the men who will, claim that 'an ever changing experience involves an ever changing theology,' but true believers will continue to base their theology upon an immutable, because an inspired Book. Let modernists assert, if they will, that 'the revelation of one age can never satisfy the needs of another,' but Orthodoxy will go on contending that truth is as unchangeable and its tenets as eternal as their Author—God. If the modernist insists upon making his religion "out of the daily experiences in the great currents of the world's life," let him join the Athenian crowd. As for evangelical believers, they will continue to count their lot with the prophet of the Old Testament and the Apostle of the New, who alike received from God an unchangeable revelation, fit not alone for their needs, their day and hour, but for the needs of all men and of all times!

It sounds quite smart to say, "The 20th Century world needs a 20th Century religion, and it is part of its task to make that religion for itself,' but the one serious attempt in that direction, characterizing modern times and called 'Christian Science,' shows how a mental and moral insanity easily results from a repudiation of the binding authority of Scripture.

We prefer, rather, the basis of the Psalmist's belief, "Thy Word is true from the beginning," and "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." We prefer the faith of our fathers, namely "that the Holy Bible was written by man divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any admixture of error, for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us, and therefore is and shall remain to the end of the world, the true center of Christian union and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds and opinions shall be tried." We believe with Paul, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God (in any age) may be perfect, thoroughly furnished in all good works" (2 Tim. 3:16-17). We believe, with Peter, that "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Pet. 1:21). We believe, with Christ, "The Scripture cannot be broken," (Jno. 10:35); "Our God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son," (Heb. 1:1-2); and this is the voice of Orthodoxy, and has been for full two thousand years!

The Powers of Orthodoxy need fresh illustration. We are now told that "ready made religion from

whatever age it may come to us, will not fit our spiritual needs, however well it may have fitted the age from which it came to us." The answer of Orthodoxy is, "Show us a human necessity not met by the Book called the Bible! Relate to us a human experience unknown to its sacred pages! State to us a problem for which it has been proven insufficient!"

Walter Rauschenbusch, liberal though he was, frankly admitted that "Insofar as humanity has as yet been redeemed, Christianity has been its redemption."

One of the most infidel productions that has ever emanated from professed Christian pens, finds itself compelled to pay this tribute to evangelicalism, "However much it has failed to appreciate the inefficiency of aristocratic conceptions in morality, to it are due the abolition of slavery, reforms in prisons, the care of the insane and of the poor, the establishment of Y. M. C. A.'s, Bible and Foreign Mission Societies, colleges and theological seminaries." The question arises as to whether evangelicalism, which is only another name for Orthodoxy, remains as adequate to the problems of the present, as it has proven itself sufficient for the interests of the past. The best answer that Orthodoxy can give to this, will be fresh illustrations of the Scripture, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." The triumph of Orthodoxy will come in proportion to its loyalty to the authoritative source of the truth—the Holy Scriptures, the incarnation of its truths in holy living, the adaptation of its truths to present per-

plexing problems, and the proclamation of its truths to all peoples! It is the task of Orthodoxy to show that evangelical Christianity has the same power to save the individual now that it had when Saul of Tarsus was converted; that it has the same power to move a city to repentance that it had when Peter preached at Pentecost; that it has the same power to create a church that is efficient as it had when the church at Ephesus was brought into being and under blessing, that it has the same power to break down racial prejudices that it exercised in the days of the Roman Empire; the same power to work social reforms that it had when it accomplished the repeal of the "Corn Laws" in England, and "the abolition of slavery" in America, that it has the same power to change the nude, filthy cannibal into a clothed, clean Christian, that it exercised in the South Sea Islands!

Let doubters doubt, if they will; but let orthodox men know that the best answer to that infidelity is a Spirit-endowed life, engaged in Spirit-animated tasks— or, in other words, Orthodoxy on the altar and at the plow.

The program of Orthodoxy should be declared.

Without controversy, it should and does accept as its task, the scripturalizing of the people, the spiritualizing of the church, and the evangelizing of the world. At a time when infidelity is doing its utmost to take the Bible from the people by bringing it into disrepute, it is ours to defend and display it, print and distribute it, preach and practice it. By

every means at our command, we should bring the attention of the people to its words of wisdom; we should emphasize its claims upon our century and our civilization; we should secure attention to it by the individual, by the home, by the school, by the church, by society at large. Our means should be on the altar to make it known; our lips should part to proclaim its sacred sentences; our lives should express its saving and sanctifying power. Our churches should be brought to bring their creeds from this Book and from it alone; to determine their conduct by studies from the same sacred source; and every unsaved man, every infidel, as well as every heathen on earth, should become to the Orthodox a conscious obligation as well as a Christian opportunity. In keeping with the suggestions of "The Continent," we need not think to patronize God by attempting for Him "a short-order Christianization of humanity", but we can please God, if we present ourselves servants to that end until the task shall be finished by the personal reappearance of His Son and the assistance of the attending hosts of heaven!

In the execution of this program, Orthodoxy must come to a new realization of the power of the printed page; to a new determination to establish and foster schools that stand for the Christianity of Christ, involving as it does the utter authority of the Bible in all matters of faith and practice; in the provision of text books for the thousands of young men and women who now plod their way through weary wastes of false philos-

ophy; in guarding pulpits against occupation by false teachers and providing them faithful expositors of the Word; and in finding, accepting and commissioning to mission fields at home and abroad, both men and women who believe God, preach His Word effectively and faithfully practice the precepts of the same.

This all, of course, involves

THE CONFLICT OF FORCES.

Christianity was not conceived in indolence, nor cultivated by ease, nor has it become a religion of conquest by indifference. Its apostles reckoned themselves "at war," and the proud boast of its greatest exponent, when he came to old age found this expression, "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith." Truly we "wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." (Eph. 6:12). That is why we are to "take unto us the whole armor of God that we may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand". If there were occasion to interpret this text, word by word, I believe I could prove from the original and from the Revised Version, that our chief enemy is now found within the church of God and that he takes the very forms anticipated by prophets and apostles, and must be met by the very weapons named in the context.

But to be specific, let me conclude by the discussion of three remarks regarding the conflict of

forces. We must meet modern philosophy with ancient faith; we must eschew Socialism and stress the Great Commission, and we must oppose that "blessed hope" to the "world betterment plan."

Modern philosophy is to be met with ancient faith. That modern philosophy is defined by its advocates as "a Christianity which knows no absolutes, but by pointing to its adaptability, can look hopefully forward to such changes as are necessary in order that it may play a leading part in the solution of our spiritual problems", and it is set up as "more defensible than is a Christianity standing rigidly for the finality of this or that doctrine or practice." The difference between such a Christianity and the Christianity of the Bible, is the difference between the shifting sands and the substantial rock. Sand has an adaptability unknown to foundation stones. It can change itself as rapidly as disturbances in civilization can occur; but it is a poor base for building. "The consciousness of the individual" now proposed as a substitute for the Word of God, is a thing as changeable as is man himself, while the Word it opposes is as stable and eternal as the Eternal One who uttered it.

When at Pentecost, Peter undertook to answer the question "What must we do to be saved"? he did not talk of his own personal experience, but produced that question by a faithful presentation of the Word from the prophet Joel, and answered it by an appeal to the same source. When the eunuch inquired of Philip "the way," he did not rehearse to him a personal experience, but an-

swered from the Scripture in Isaiah. When the Philippian jailor, at midnight, besought Paul and his associates saying, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" they pointed him to the Lord Jesus Christ and quoted him promises from the Old Testament, speaking not only unto him "the word of the Lord, but to all that were in his house." If any preacher has lived who would have been justified in making a personal experience the beginning and the end of religious convictions, Paul was that man; but while he rehearsed it, he did it always to demonstrate the Deity of Christ, and to illustrate the inspiration of the prophets.

A recent writer, in spite of his known leanings toward a social gospel, frankly admits that the world has tried education, has tried science, has tried ecclesiasticism, has tried diplomacy, and says one after another they have disappointed the expectations of their respective advocates, and he concludes, "There is just one last hope for man and one last recourse for the world,—the Son of Man has come from God and has come to save the world, so that if 'man's extremity is God's opportunity', there is just one thing for the world to do now—learn of Jesus Christ and try His gospel." To be sure that gospel is ancient. Two thousand years since it flowered, and back into human history fifteen hundred years further its Hebrew roots have spread themselves, and yet its hoary age, instead of illustrating weakness, reveals to the world that there is but one saving power,—Christ,—the Word!

Truly, we must now choose between Christ and

chaos; between the Word and the wreck of a world!

This all leads me to the most important matter of the moment, to the most serious subject of this discourse, and in my judgment, to the most colossal interest of this hour, namely, in opposing modern philosophy with ancient faith we need an adequate method and means.

In America today there are fifty millionaires, and more,—great men of God, who adore His Son, trust absolutely in His gospel of grace, and stand ready to make any reasonable sacrifice for His Name's sake. If those men would unite their counsels and fortune and create **a great orthodox, premillenarian theological seminary,** with a faculty unequaled by any to be found on the face of the earth, one thousand students would find their way into it in the first year after its opening; the great pulpits of the land that now search in vain for adequate leadership, would lift their heads with hope, and the cause of truth would be nearer triumph than it has been since Daniel Whitby interjected his false interpretations into Scripture, and Strauss conceived and exploited his false philosophy concerning the "Man from Nazareth," or Darwin dared ventilate his vaporings in the name of Science.

I call upon the orthodox laymen whom God has blessed with wealth, to look on their opportunity and give us a school such as thousands of students pray for and await, the output of which ten thousand pulpits will need and would willingly accept,

ere ten years have passed. In my judgment, the $336,000,000 planned and begged by the Interchurch, if the last penny had been raised, and expended according to their plans, would have put the cause of God forward in nothing, since vastly more of it would have been expended on infidel schools and false teachers destined for home and foreign fields, than would ever have reached institutions of loyal character or individuals of orthodox convictions.

The creation of such a Seminary would enable us to win in the two additional points mentioned—

Social service should be eschewed and the Great Commission stressed. To be sure, the term Social service, like its advocates, is impossible of understanding, much less of definition, but this nebulous hypothesis was made the watch-word in the "Men and Religion Forward Movement;" has been quite in the ascendant in the Interchurch, and is the shibboleth of the self-styled "scientific." Its impotence is being increasingly illustrated, and its increasing failure will clear the ground for the Great Commission with its assertion of divine authority and power on the part of Jesus, its divine commission of the church, its divinely ordained ordinances and its promise of divine presence with those who are keeping the divine commandments.

If the cry of the heathen world is the challenge of Orthodoxy, the command of the exalted Christ is its marching order.

Finally the "world-betterment" plan should be opposed by that "Blessed Hope." Employing the

language of another, the modern American school of "hustle" has sought to introduce into religion a new vigor that would 'secure the aims of the church with a victorious dash, electrifying humanity' but up to the present this Twentieth Century program has proven no aid whatever to spiritual forces, and on the confession of its own exponents, "the world was never in a worse way." The problems of human life were never so grave; the disturbance of human society was never so great; the prospects of the future were never so appalling. Why is it not a good thing to remind the world of the confessions unwittingly made by the Modernist such, for instance, as "the Christianity of Paul was also dominated by a vivid eschatological hope * * * The heavenly Christ with whom he enjoyed a permanent mystical union, as realistic as that of the devotee in any of the 'mystery cults', was the Jewish Messiah, soon to come on the clouds in glory, and one of the chief incentives of missionary enterprise was the thought of this impending event." That incentive remained with every apostle of the New Testament; that incentive accounts for the enthusiasm of the early church fathers; that incentive gave to the world some brilliant lights to shine in the darkness of the Middle Ages; that incentive accounts for the enthusiasm of the great souls of yesterday—such as Guinness, Spurgeon, Moody, Pierson, Gordon and others too numerous to mention; that incentive has given power to the multiplied Bible Conferences from the beginnings at Northfield and Keswick until now;

that incentive has given birth and development to the many modern Bible Training Schools; that incentive has attracted attention to the effectiveness of the preaching in practically every prominent pulpit in the world; that incentive will call new men into the ministry in ever increasing numbers, and young women to mission fields in mighty multitudes; that incentive, and that alone, will rise to the exigencies of the Great Commission itself, and lead us to attempt the evangelization of the world in this generation.

Dr. William Newton Clarke, late professor of Colgate University, once said, "When the kingdom has come, the relations of man with man, of man with woman, of parent with child, of neighbor with neighbor, of individual with society, of class with class, of trade with trade, of citizen with state, of strong with weak, of nation with nation, of race with race will be determined, and pervaded by the mind of Christ, which is the will of God." Certainly; but it is doubtful if the sceptical professor saw the meaning of his own words. All of that will have come when Christ has come. That is the very occasion of the advent cry. "Come, Lord Jesus, and come quickly," and of the holy petition, "Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done, in earth as it is in heaven."

NOTE: Read "Rietschlian Theology and the Evangelical Faith" by James Orr, and "Crisis in Church and School," Geo. W. McPherson.